DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 471 968 TM 03: 698

AUTHOR	High, Clennis F.
TITLE	An Historical, Perceptive, and Qualitative Analysis of the Texas Academic Skills Program (TASP): Where Do We Go from Here?
PUB DATE	2002-10-00
NOTE	52p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Junior Community College Student Personnel Association of Texas (Texas, October, 2002).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Achievement Gains; Data Collection; Elementary Secondary Education; Enrollment; Higher Education; Minority Groups; *State Programs; Student Surveys; *Test Results; *Testing Programs; Urban Universities
IDENTIFIERS	Texas; *Texas Academic Skills Program

ABSTRACT

Building on two previous studies in 1997 and 1999, this study aimed to: (1) determine whether the Texas Academic Skills Program (TASP) has had a positive impact on students' academic performance; (2) determine the perception of the TASP among key community, junior, and technical college personnel across Texas; and (3) determine the impact on students entering urban colleges, where the minority enrollment is traditionally the highest. Using a triangular approach, the researcher conducted a secondary analysis of state-collected data, a statewide survey study, and several interviews with students to address the objectives of the study. A review of the results of years of TASP scores and analysis of survey data for 123 counselors, advisors, and deans from across the state suggest that the TASP program has not aided in the enhancement of students' academic performance at any time during its existence. In addition, the overall perception of those surveyed is that TASP does cause a significant enrollment problem for students who want to come to college in Texas. Urban colleges, which are traditionally heavily populated by minorities, seem to be affected more so than other colleges around the state. Several flaws in the way data is reported are identified, and some recommendations are made to improve data reporting. An appendix contains a chi square analysis for a survey item, a copy of the survey and responses, examples of documents used in the study, a list of participating institutions, and a sample institutional profile. (Author/SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 471 968

Texas Academic Skills Program (TASP): Where Do We Go From Here

Clennis F. High

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. F. High

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

TM034698

This paper is prepared for the:
Annual Junior Community College Student Personnel Association of Texas (JCCSPAT)
October 2002

Executive Summary

An Historical, Perceptive, and Qualitative Analysis of the Texas Academic Skills Program (TASP): Where do we go from Here?

A Report for Dissemination prepared by Dr. Clennis F. High
Counselor and Instructor at Houston Community College

Introduction

As a result of many educators and community members voicing concerns about the effect of the TASP program on students' progress at junior and community colleges, this researcher decided to take a long look at the TASP situation. In August 2001 this researcher began to design a study to ascertain whether TASP has been successful, if knowledgeable individuals believed TASP impeded the progress of students, and to speak with several students regarding their experience with TASP. To achieve this it was decided that a method should be used that incorporated several ways to obtain data, this method is normally called triangular research. To this end documents were obtained from THECB, a survey was designed and tested, and efforts were made to contact several students for brief interviews.

Because of the tragedy this country faced in early September 2001 the study had to be delayed several months. By contacting Mr. James Dilling, Program Director at THECB, I was able to obtain records from 1991-2000 for analysis. Also by assessing the Boards web site I was able to down load the two TASP evaluations done by Hunter Boylan several years ago. After obtaining and reviewing these documents I conducted an extensive survey study giving every community college in the state a chance to respond, 90% of those contacted responded. The questionnaire used was simple in design and only included four questions about TASP. Lastly a review was done of previous studies on TASP conducted by this researcher.

Because of the great amount of information covered in this study, limited human and material resources, and time restraints this study was not completed until late May 2002. With the information obtained from these resources certain information was gained about TASP. Specifically, three questions were addressed in this study.

Has TASP made a positive impact on students' academic performance?

Records and history indicates for the periods studied (1992-2000) students' academic performance has not been enhanced as a result of the TASP program. There has been no consistent overall improvement in test outcomes. The period between 1998 and 2000 surprisingly shows that as the number of students who took remedial courses constantly increase, their pass rates on TASP decreased. Moreover, the entire period studied showed little or no improvement for community and junior college students on TASP performance. Though the past rates overall were poor, those for urban community colleges, when they were separated and compared with the others, were even more dismal. Suburban colleges where students generally have more resources have

consistently out performed rural and urban colleges. *It must be noted that TASP did not cause students to perform at these low levels, but no improvement has been gained as a result of TASP.* A majority of data obtained for secondary analyses gave warnings, cautions, amendments, and possible reasons for low pass rates as well as describing periodic changes, but the one constant was low performance.

What is the perception of TASP's impact on students as seen by key college personnel?

Deans, counselors, and advisors across the state were surveyed. These individuals were chosen for study, because they have been more involved with TASP rules, regulations, and procedures than others on junior and community college campuses. Also they are the first to be contacted by students in most cases and converse regularly with them regarding matters such as TASP. It should be noted that the term "key" personnel here does not in any way demean college administrators, but simply refers to those in regular first hand contact with students and their TASP situations.

Although it cannot be said that everyone's perception of TASP is negative, it can be stated however that the prevailing perception of those surveyed generally is TASP is not helping academically and may be impeding student's ability to attend college. Three overlying quantitative questions were asked on the survey and the following results were obtained.

54% of the overall sample indicated they feel TASP does cause a significant problem for students wanting to go to college.

Slightly more than one third (34.1%) agreed TASP has helped in improving academic performance.

Only 37% of those surveyed agreed TASP is a positive strategy toward Texas' efforts to provide quality education to all students.

Does TASP cause a significant problem for student wanting to attend urban colleges?

The results of the statewide survey above indicate that overall respondents believe TASP poses a significant problem. **Disturbingly 66% of those coming from urban colleges believed TASP causes a significant problem for students wanting to go to college.** It appears respondents from urban colleges see TASP as being a greater problem than do those at other colleges, in regard to it being an entrance obstruction. As these people work regularly with students, it is very possible that students at urban colleges may in fact be having greater problems than others. This is not to be taken lightly, as these same students traditionally have other educational and social concerns. It is widely accepted that urban colleges are largely populated with minorities and those from lower socio-economic-statuses.

*Responses from an open-ended question on the survey simply mirrored the above perceptions. Overall people seemed to feel TASP was more of a problem than an asset, and may be complicating students' ability to enter college

Institutional Program Plans

Review of the documents and literature revealed that colleges have been advised to provide a "Developmental Plan". These plans appear to vary widely in makeup and in many cases are somewhat vague. However, it seems that for the most part the plans seek to incorporate guidelines set forth by the THECB. Nevertheless, some of these plans have mandated passing scores on alternative-TASP tests higher than those required by the state. This equates to students being able to pass based on state TASP requirements, but are forced to take non-credit developmental courses based on some institutional requirement. There is also evidence that these plans lack equity and consistency among colleges. This could create a new series of *issues and concerns.* The main problem is students are afraid of TASP, and to replicate that experience for students may not be a step forward!

Recommendations

Based on careful analysis of all data, reviewing past research on TASP, I make the following Recommendations:

1. **The TASP program as it now stands should be eliminated and its name changed to reflect its close association to developmental education:** The TASP program has not done what it purported to do. Data indicates that in the present form it is causing more harm than good. It is a fact that this program is not the cause of low performance by Texas students, but it does not seem to be helping the problem. Because of the complexity of the program guidelines, there has been more focus put on policy and procedure than on outcomes, at the expense of students. It is believed by the researcher, however, that it is essential to have some collective body or organization in place to monitor progress, equality and assure accountability of developmental education in the state.

2. **Individual colleges must do a better job in monitoring their progress with developmental education using some common measure:** In regard to the current developmental education situation it can be argued to the degree that a developmental program is effective, it is to that degree that it's students will be successful… Because there is so little summative program evaluation done at

community and junior colleges it is hard to accurately and fairly assess how well these programs are living up to their own standards. One method used to evaluate developmental education by some colleges is looking at how well students do in college-level classes after completing the required developmental course work, this method works well at most schools, and is a logical method. To do a better job of evaluating these programs, college personnel will need to be adequately trained in research methods and be fully aware of all the possible intervening factors that may impact programs outcomes. For the current *Self-studies* conducted by many colleges to be meaningful the results and outcomes should be compared to some relative measure or measures. Finally, cohort studies should not be used to make general statements about all students at a college or students statewide.

3. **College Developmental plans should be monitored for fairness, equity, and Compatibility:** These plans would serve the student better if there were common threads running through them all, which are focused on all Texas students, not just those at a particular college. For example, as all faculty teaching in this state must have certain credentials and maintain certain standards, all developmental course work should be accepted across the board by all colleges-this is done for most core courses currently. Moreover, there should be a student *"hold harmless"* statement issued by the state relative to these new developmental plans. This would simply state that no developmental plan should require a standard for students higher than that required by the state (in this case by the TASP program). This thereby holds students harmless as a result of the state allowing local colleges to create their own plans. Doing this would help to assure that students will not be burdened more than they already are. As the TASP test has been established as a standardized instrument with acceptable validity and reliability and the several alternative-TASP tests have been shown to statistically compare favorably with the TASP test, colleges do not have to reinvent the wheel-the work has already been done for them by qualified professionals.

4. **The distinct differences between Urban, Suburban, and Rural community and Junior colleges should be acknowledged:** It is clear that there are important differences between these colleges, the research has shown that. These differences are not solely related to the physical location of these colleges, but other factors. Suburban colleges normally are populated by students coming from suburban school districts with vast resources and higher scores on standardized tests (i.e. TASP, TAAS, SAT, ACT). In addition they are largely white and most have middle to upper middle-class parents. On the other hand urban colleges are traditionally heavily populated by minorities coming from poorer inner-city school districts, and families have less resources and education. Rural colleges have other characteristics that set them apart on several important characteristics. The point here is there are many social dynamics that are present at some colleges and not present at others. In other words, all things are not equal. When segregated by type, the data shows that suburban colleges as a group out perform the two other groups on TASP performance. Also, the survey data further

Abstract

Building on two previous studies in 1997 and 1999 respectively, the researcher sets out to (1) ascertain if the TASP program has had a positive impact on students' academic performance, (2) determine what the perception of the TASP situation is among key community, junior, and technical personnel across the state is, and (3) what its impact is on students entering urban colleges where the minority enrollment is traditionally the highest. Using what he calls a *triangular* approach the researcher employs secondary analysis of state collected data, a statewide survey study, and several interviews with students to address the objectives of this study. After reviewing the results of years of TASP scores, analyzing survey results for one hundred and twenty three counselors, advisors, and deans from a cross the state of Texas the researcher came to several conclusions. First, the TASP program has not aided in the enhancement of students' academic performance at any time during its existence. Secondly, the overall perception of those surveyed is that TASP does cause a significant enrollment problem for students who want to come to college in Texas. Finally, urban colleges, which are traditionally heavily populated by minorities, seem to be affected more so than other colleges around the state. The researcher points out several flaws in the way data is reported and provides several recommendations.

An Historical, Perceptive, and Qualitative Analysis of the Texas Academic Skills Program (TASP): Where Do We Go From Here?

Introduction

The Texas Legislature initiated the Texas Academic Skills Program (TASP) to address rising academic deficiencies by students entering college. In July 1986 the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) released a report, which revealed major problems in our educational process. This report, entitled *A Generation of Failure: The Case for Testing and Remediation in Texas Higher Education*, showed the problems to be basically in the areas of reading, writing, and mathematics. As a result, the 70th legislature one year later (1987) mandated Texas Education Code 51.306. This called for, and was the beginning of, a basic skills test.

The TASP program is designed to utilize two methods to measure selected academic abilities and guide students that may be found lacking in those abilities. The first of these is the TASP test, which consists of reading, writing, and mathematics components. The THECB, Texas Education Agency (TEA), National Evaluation Systems (NES), and many educators worked on the development of this test. All reports that I am aware of related to the instrument indicate it to be a standardized test that is both *reliable* and *valid*. Secondly, counseling and advisement is used to assist students with their academic growth. Because of constant changes in the regulations and rules of this test it has been extremely difficult for counselors to do solid advisement. In some cases counselors and advisors act as *academic parole officers* to students not clear of TASP liability, rather than caring trained professionals. Both components are required for non-exempt students who enter public colleges and universities in Texas.

Based on the judgment of the legislature, it was determined that through skillful teaching and masterful counseling the problem of low academic performance by Texas students could be curtailed. Though the intent of this governmental body was admirable and noble, the reality of TASP is that it is likely causing more problems than remedies. In fact, there are many who believe the test is impeding the progress of a great number of our students wanting to enter college and it has not effectively addressed the academic problems as intended. Moreover, institutions have to increase staff and change academic programs just to accommodate the TASP issue. It is the prevailing belief of many educators that TASP has become more of a political agenda than savior of Texas students. Though the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board initially provided precise information on the rules and requirements that pertained to TASP, over the years those have become confusing and ambiguous. At this point colleges, in many cases, are making-up rules and interpreting published procedures as best they can. These vague regulations are especially problematic for students.

Accountability was also a major impetus for creating this program with its measurement component. Nonetheless, at this point it is extremely difficult to determine

if students are improving academically as a result of TASP. The rules and regulations recently implemented make it possible for students who have failed a part of TASP to continue with their studies without taking any remedial course work. Many of these students retake the test before taking the required classes. How do they compare to those who do take the required courses? No one knows, because no comparison data is being kept to my knowledge. This is an interesting and controversial situation because some studies (High, 1996, Boylan, 1998) have shown that the developmental classes have not been that effective in preparing students for TASP. Hunter Boylan (1996 & 1998) conducted one of the most comprehensive studies done on TASP. Boylan, (1998) and his team from the National Center for Developmental Education (NCDE) found that it is difficult to find quantitative data, which indicates that TASP has improved the quality of education in this state. What maybe more disturbing is he found significant problems with colleges measuring the effectiveness of remedial classes. Boylan concluded:

> 'Ongoing and systematic evaluation of outcomes of remedial courses and programs is rare. Although there is a strong emphasis on compliance with TASP regulations among Texas colleges and universities there is little emphasis on accountability for the outcomes of TASP remediation.' (Boylan, 1996, p. 2)

In regard to this finding, it is likely that many community college personnel are not certain how too go about doing an effective summative evaluation. Current research shows that 25% of those doing these types of evaluations do not have adequate research skills, and programs are negatively impacted as a result (High, 2000).

Though his findings indicated there were not a significant number of community college students who did not complete their two-year degree as a result of TASP, Boylan conceded that many of these students had dropped out of school prior to making it to that point. It would be interesting to know how many of those did so as a result of TASP. Boylan's follow-up study in 1998 was based on responses from a *self-report* survey from a non-probability sample. This study, however, indicated no major changes in TASP outcomes and that community college students were less successful than those at universities.

Another study was conducted by this researcher in 1996 entitled: *The Texas Study: A Regression Analysis of Selected Factors that Influence the Scores of Students on the TASP Test.* This study utilized several statistical methods to ascertain the impact of several selected variables on students' TASP performance. A most surprising finding in this study was that the number of remedial classes students took had little or no influence on that performance. When colleges were segregated by type (urban, suburban, and rural), the data showed differences in performance of the three groups. Analyses of state records in that study showed urban and rural colleges did not do as well as suburban community colleges.

Other studies done to associate TASP success to remedial completion utilized secondary analyses of flawed cohort data. This data is reported to the state once a year and its accuracy is largely dependent on the expertise of college personnel and quality of technology at individual colleges. These factors vary based on a number of other factors. From the outset most of these studies are doomed to be plagued with what I call *cohort*

confounding. Because cohorts represent an entering group with certain innate, socio-economic, demographic, and other characteristics, findings from these studies cannot and should not be generalized to entire populations; these populations may be different from the cohort group in important ways. *External validity* and *population validity* is always hard to prove in these studies.

Significance

This study seeks too ascertain (1) if TASP has made a positive impact on students' academic performance, (2) what the perception of it's impact is among key college personnel across the state, and (3) does it pose a significant problem for students wanting to enter urban colleges. This is important, because urban community colleges have a relatively large proportion of minority and first time college students. The most current records from the Coordinating Board indicate that 44% of students enrolled, at anytime during the 98-99 school year, were of some minority group. Given the increase of minorities in the state in the last three years I suspect that percentage has changed.

It is important to taxpayers that their dollars are spent as efficiently as possible. If students are required to take remedial classes, then it is only fair to taxpayers that we (1) do the best job possible with these students, and (2) provide measures of accountability. Breneman and Haarlow (1998) estimated that remedial education cost public institutions about 1 billion dollars per year in the U.S. With the costs of developmental education, TASP waivers, and other resources the cost in Texas has to be astronomical. Some argue that money spent on developmental education is relatively small when compared to overall budgets, but taxpayers are not likely to share that view. Also as the new emphasis in Texas is on "closing the gaps", it is important that all possibilities are explored to assure all individuals and groups are allowed the opportunity to succeed or fail in higher education. This can only happen if doors are open and students are not intimidated by high stakes assessments.

There is also the case for ethical responsibility in education. Texas has experienced several problems here lately in education. We have had students scoring below the national average on standardized tests, and the problems in our public schools is known to all of us. Most of the students we get come from this system; we are aware of that when we take their tuition and take these students in on our campuses. So, we are aware of who our students are and know something about their academic background. We cannot make up for any injustices students may have incurred before we got them, but we should be doing our best to help them succeed, not constantly referring to what was not done prior to them coming to us. I see this as an ethical responsibility once we open our doors to these students.

Also important is the ripple effect that education has on individuals and our social and economic environment. I label these as "*latent effects of education.*" It is beneficial to everyone when people are allowed to seek their dreams; those who are not could very well end up as social problems. Data already shows that the state could have an abnormally large unskilled/under-educated population in the future. This could very well be a precursor to other social ills such as increases in public assistance; expansion of our already huge prison system; creation of a new "underclass", and more.

As a counselor and faculty member I feel these issues are paramount in the educational process at Texas' community colleges, as well as others. Though several studies have been done in regard to TASP, none approached the issue from this perspective. The findings may be added to the body of knowledge already known about TASP to help make decisions about its future direction. Moreover, this information should be utilized by other states who may be contemplating the initiation of a "high-stakes" test, those who currently have them, and even by the U.S. Department of Education, which has expressed the need for a national examination on some level.

Methods

This study was conducted using a triangular process. Records, including historical results, for TASP will be obtained from the (THECB). These were analyzed to determine if students at community, junior, and technical colleges have academically improved in the three areas of reading, writing, and mathematics. These records include the earliest results to the most recent available results provided by the board. Urban colleges were statistically segregated from other colleges to ascertain if their results are significantly different from those colleges, and to see if respondents perceptions are associated to the type of college they come from. Urban schools were categorized as urban based on self-identification found in their literature (i.e. catalogs, handbooks, internet, etc.) and literature written about them; the same will apply to suburban and rural schools. The second part of the study centered a round the results of a questionnaire submitted to randomly selected community, junior, and technical colleges in the state in fall 2001. The sample respondents included personnel most closely in contact with students during the college entrance and registration process (i.e. counselors, advisors, academic and student service deans, etc). In all cases these are among the first people students come in contact with. In many cases these people talk with and advise individuals who never appear on record and are not counted in any statistics (High, 1999). Because the survey instrument includes a question about academic improvement based on TASP, academic deans will also be added to the sample. These deans are also taking a more active roll with registering students and addressing TASP issues, because of recent changes in TASP rules.

These people were chosen because they are arguably the most in touch with the TASP situation on a day-to-day basis. Community, junior and technical colleges were chosen for analyses, because they have the greatest number of students who take the TASP test; current data indicate more students are attending these "open-door" colleges. The results of the survey were analyzed using descriptive and parametric statistical procedures. The data were first arrayed in tables and graphs, which shows the numerical dynamics of each variable and for the entire sample. However, because the data is based on sample

analyses, and not population parameters, population estimation procedures will be utilized with the (90%) confidence level (alpha = .10) as the test standard. This is acceptable in *exploratory* educational research (Borg and Gall, 1989). More specifically interval estimates were used for estimating the accuracy of sample percentages and proportions. Also because the colleges were segregated into groups and count-data was compiled per group, the Chi-Square statistic was calculated to ascertain if the item responses were associated or related to particular college type for item number one.

Finally several students were interviewed to allow the reader to hear their story. Too often educational research is so focused on research design and statistical procedures that the real beneficiary- the student- is put in the background. It is imperative that students at urban colleges be heard. It is this researcher's opinion that the presentation of numbers, graphs, and statistics in educational research without student input compromises any conclusions derived from a study, which will ultimately affect those students. Explanations of the statistical logic and a brief annotated reference page have been put into the appendix section of this paper. This will help the layperson gain a general understanding of the methods used here.

Operational Definition of Key Terms

For consistency of meaning and context in which important terms are used in this study I am providing operational definition of terms. It is important to understand the association between operational terms and the study to which they pertain. I have included a brief statement and definition in the back of the document to address this for those not familiar with such scientific jargon.

Operational meanings in this study for the following terms include:

Remedial Classes: This term will be used interchangeably with developmental. Either identifies classes taken by students as a result of a placement test and will generally not transfer as college-level credit. Most of these classes are thought to help students prepare for TASP and/or college-level classes. The reader will also see the word "remediated" associated with these classes. Though not found in Standard English, in this study, it refers to students who have taken these classes.

Urban College: A college is considered urban if it identifies itself as urban in its publications or in the 2001, *Peterson's Guide to 2-Year Colleges, 31st Ed.* Generally these colleges are in relatively large cites and have large minority student populations.

Suburban College: These colleges were also categorized based on self-identification, or the Peterson Guide, which ever was available. Suburban colleges are generally found outside of large cities, but some who are fifty or more miles from large cities do identify themselves as being suburban based on local demographics, economic factors, and other factors. These colleges generally have less minorities enrolled compared to urban colleges.

Rural College: Like urban and suburban colleges, rural colleges were categorized based on self-identification, or the Peterson Guide. These colleges are also referred to as "small-town" colleges in the literature. These colleges are located in less populated areas and some do have considerable minority enrollment.

Counselors: Because of the varied uses of this title care was taken to reflect this in sample selection. For this study counselors include all having the title of counselor, advisor, or counseling chair or director. Based on contact with the various colleges all of these work with students during registration and are required to understand and utilize TASP rules and policies.

Academic Dean: Individuals whose institutional title is that of dean of a particular academic or workforce discipline.

CTC: Community and Technical Colleges

Student Services Dean: This includes those having titles of Student Service Dean or Directors of Student Services. These were found being used interchangeably among many colleges.

> Though the titles may vary somewhat from college to college, conversations with respondents indicate they are knowledgeable about TASP and student issues to the extent their responses are valid.

Instruments for Data Collection

Data was collected from documents obtained from the THECB covering TASP results from 1993-1999 and it is my understanding these are the only sources available for this research according to the individuals from the Board who contacted me in September of this year. The earlier data summaries are straightforward and easy to read for most people. But as the rules changed over the years the data became more difficult to interpret. Overall the summaries covered community and technical colleges (CTC) and universities separately, this study focuses on the former. Also, the summaries include data for the three sections of TASP, and by initial attempt and those passing all three sections ignoring whether it was a first or subsequent attempt, this term in the last few years is called "retake attempts". Interestingly, though many of the students took remedial classes before retaking the test the scores are not noticeably different, in fact in some years the initial attempt is better than the retake. In all analyses here the retake or passing all parts are used. Examples of these are provided in the appendix.

Also, a four-item survey was constructed and sent via email to respondents. It is not likely that this method biased the results as every college has this technology available to them. The questions sought to measure respondent's perception of the affect of TASP in regard to whether it influences students' ability to enter college; whether it has enhanced students' academic performance; and if it has been a good strategy in Texas' efforts to provide quality education too all students. Item number four asks the respondents to make one statement that reflects their overall perception of TASP. The items on this survey were developed over a three-week period with the input and watchful eyes of counselors, advisors, and deans. The entire study, including the survey instrument was piloted prior

to this study. Based on the process followed and input from the members of the intended population it is believed that this questionnaire has sufficient *content validity* for this study and accurately measures what it was intended measure. The Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha was used to establish *internal consistency* reliability. The coefficient (.81) for the survey items was substantial for survey research (Edwards, et al).

Survey Sample

The total number of respondents contacted by email and phone for this survey was one hundred twenty three (n =123). There were 188 respondents selected for contact for this study; valid contact information could not be obtained for eight. This resulted in 180 respondents being contacted; this is the number used for the response rate. Out of that number 123, or 68.3% responded. According to Earl Babbie (1973) rates of 50% or greater are adequate; 60% is good, and 70% or more is very good. The number of respondents (n =188) selected for this study was not arbitrary. This sample-size was selected to protect against sample-error. Some error is always inherent when using samples to estimate population values, but if a random sample is collected the researched can predict how much variation to expect (sample error) with a given sample size at a predetermined confidence level (Ferguson, 1981). A sample size of 123 provides a margin of error of 7.4%. This margin of error will be accurate 90 out of 100 times in the long run based on probability theory. Moreover, Seymour Sudman (1976) has indicated that survey research should have at least 100 subjects for each major group (community colleges) and between 20-50 for each major subgroup (urban, suburban, and rural). The sample used here meets these standards and should yield meaningful results.

Sample Design

The sampling procedure was a long and laborious process in this study, and took more time than any other activity. Given the importance of this sample, great care was given to minimize sample error, and to allow a generous amount of respondents.
Sampling frames comprised of counselors, advisors, academic and student service deans were developed for each school. These were created from catalogs, web, pages, and personal contacts with many school departments by telephone; these were combined into a master list from which the sample was drawn. Great effort was taken to create a complete and accurate list. The respondents were randomly selected from this master list. The greatest proportion of respondents was counselors and advisors, because there were simply more of them. These people were chosen to be respondents because they are more aware of TASP policies; work closely with students during registration periods; and are usually involved when a TASP issue comes up, particularly counselors and advisors. Every public community, junior, and technical college in the state was contacted to be included in the sample.

The THECB records used in this study show there are 84 colleges. However, they count districts (i.e. North Harris Montgomery County Community College District, Dallas County Community College District, etc) as well as every college within that district, there by creating duplicates in some cases. When the colleges were counted individually there were a total of 48 for this study. A total of 43 (90%) colleges

responded to this study. Care was taken to include respondents from different campuses who were part of multi-college systems (i.e. Houston Community College System, Austin CC. etc.). The random sample also included adequate responses from urban (41), suburban (30), and rural (52) colleges.

It was the researchers intent to draw a solid random sample from the colleges in this state. It was necessary to contact some colleges and some respondents several times, but the results were positive. The five colleges not responding were not clustered in any part of the state, nor were they disproportionately urban, suburban, or rural. Moreover, wording of items, handling of data, using appropriate statistical methods, and other steps were done carefully to control *non-sampling error,* which cannot be estimated numerically.

Historical Analyses of TASP results

While working with this data and all through this study it became apparent to me that changes are needed. Accountability cannot be enforced or expected if the data used to measure it is "iffy". The process used in Texas requires two levels of data collection. First the colleges collect data and then this data is sent to the state. Since the state acts as a depository of this data it can't be expected to verify its accuracy, but colleges are closer to the raw collection process and could do a lot to enhance their processes. These colleges are also in a position to conduct ongoing periodic studies to monitor their progress in key areas. Activities such as these would go far to inform schools as to what they are doing well and what needs improvement.

The following analyses highlight the results of the TASP section for the available data provided by the (THECB) in September 2001.The data in table 1 comes from the report entitled " Texas Academic Skills Program Summary TASP Test Results". Table 2 highlights data analyzed from Data Resources for 2001 LBB Performance Measures Texas Public Community and Technical Colleges: Percent of Remedial Students Who Pass TASP. This data was obtained from the THECB, and that agency has advised this researcher that this is the most complete set of data that can be obtained at this time. The data in Table 1 has been segregated by college type (urban, suburban, and rural) based on self-definition by college as described in the operations section. Table 2 shows overall performance for all colleges collectively from 1998-2000. The data in this analysis (table 1) was created by segregating colleges (urban, suburban, and rural), summing the pass-rate for each individual category for each school year, then calculating an overall average for each group. This is similar to the method used by the state to calculate pass rates. The average pass rate for the period 1993-1999 is simply the average of each column. The data in table 2 gives the pass rates as reported by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board for all Texas public community and technical colleges for 1998-2000. The complete documents from which this data was extracted can be obtained from the Board, but I have included portions of the document that I used in this study in the appendix section.

The accuracy of secondary analyses of any data is largely dependent on understanding how the data were collected, and reporting only what is presented with out extrapolation beyond that point (in descriptive studies). The researcher cannot, and should not, attest to data collection accuracy. This is particularly true when data comes from databases as

large and complex as that maintained by this state, or any state for that matter. However, because of the knowledge-level and expertise of the data collectors at the state-level, it is believed that all data reviewed here are good "indexes" of what is being measured and therefore is adequate for this study. Specifically, it is the best data available at this time.

Table 1

Historical Analyses from Summary TASP Test Results

School Year	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total for all CTC
93-94	44.1%	50.1%	42%	46%
94-95	45.7%	49.8%	**59.7%**	46.2%
95-96	37.2%	42.8%	35.5%	38.1%
96-97	36.9%	46.7%	36.1%	39.9%
97-98	41.3%	46.3%	37.3%	40.6%
98-99	26%	40.5%	35.1%	34.9%
Ave. pass rates for period 93-99	39% (urban)	46% (suburban)	41% * (rural)	41% (all ctc)

In summary, suburban colleges clearly out perform urban and rural colleges. Without the "outlier" value of 59.7 rural colleges would have actually averaged at or below the urban colleges. In fact, with the exception of 98-99 and 94-95 rural colleges' past rates were lower than urban and suburban colleges. The descriptive data provides no explanation for this numerical deviation in school year 94-95 for rural colleges. When the data is viewed with a discerning eye it is clear that suburban colleges are consistent in their performance over the two other categories, urban and rural.

Moreover, it is, or should be clear that students' performance in the three areas of writing, reading, and mathematics has not improved over the period. As groups, no category has exceeded the 50th percentile pass rate more than twice. So, based on what we know about the performance of these colleges in general, and as separate categories, the data has not shown that students have improved as a result of remediation for the years 1993-1999. Further, the report for 1993-1994 (the earliest period in this analysis) indicates, "The overall pass rate fell in academic year 1993-94 by 13% points from the previous academic year". The report goes on to give reasons for this decline from the 1992-93 school year. In essence, what can be surmised from the report is no improvement took place between these periods (92-93,93-94) either. Partial reports are included in the back of this paper; most of the complete reports are too long to attach to this document, but may be obtained from THECB through the freedom of information act.

Table 2

Analysis from Data Resources for the 2001 LBB Performance Measures

Year ----------2000	1999	1998
Number taking----------167,165 remediation	142,518	116,600
Pass-rates ---------- **9.47%** for remediated students at all colleges	**12.44%**	**13.69%**

***These percentages represent the students, after taking remedial courses, passed TASP by THECB standards**

The above table highlights the number of unduplicated remediated students who passed all parts of TASP *or otherwise met the educational requirements of the TASP program.* Note that over the three year period there has been a downward trend. These data are consistent with that in table 1. The number of students taking these remedial classes increases an average of 25,283 over this period, however the number of students passing TASP decreased an average of 2.11% over this same period with the lowest being 9.47% during the year 2000.

One part of this report is not shown in the data I received, therefore cannot be analyzed. Each college has to make a projection as to the "target" percent of these students who will pass the test. If the number of students passing is less than the projection, the colleges have to respond to the THECB to provide a reason for the variation in the projected number and the actual number passing. It would be interesting to review these reports, but the researcher was advised that the Board has not traditionally made the report available as a public document, and the researcher did not pursue this avenue, as it was not crucial for this study.

Problems with data collection and analyses

A word about the data that has been analyzed is in order here. The state agencies that manage and produce this data have a monumental task. When the various policy changes are included into the equation, it is almost impossible to get accurate state-level TASP data. The reality here is that analyzing this data in its current form is a statistician's nightmare. THECB relies on the individual colleges to submit clean, and relatively accurate data; that is largely dependent on the expertise of those collecting at the college-level as well as available technology and resources. Too, there have been so many *ins* and *outs*, and changes in TASP policy and passing scores, that it is difficult at best to capture

accurate numbers. When there are so many *confounding factors* the effectiveness of remedial work cannot be determined without the use of appropriate statistical methods at the college-level.

A list of examples in changes over the years can be given. In 1993, many students were exempted from taking the TASP test based on acceptable scores from other test (i.e. SAT, ACT, and TAAS). In 1997 the Texas Legislature authorized the use of *alternative-test* to the official TASP. These include ASSET and COMPASS from ACT, and MAPS and ACCUPLACER from the College Board. Consequently, many students take tests other than the TASP. The results from these tests are reported to the THECB by the individual colleges, and sometimes factored into TASP results. In September 1995, the passing scores for the math and reading sections were raised to 230, ten points higher than they had been. Moreover, section 51.306 of the Texas Education Code requires students who fail TASP to take remedial classes until they can perform at college-level. This is theoretically measured by passing TASP when it is retaken (this can also be shown now by making a "B" in certain courses). In the real world, students who fail TASP can retake it at any time, not just at the completion of remedial classes, and they do. Therefore, the reports used to show effectiveness are not entirely accurate, and are said to be a "loose index" for evaluating remedial education effectiveness. In addition, House Bill (HB) 2109 amends section 51.306 by allowing high school students from any state with a 3.5 avg. on a 4.0 scale TASP exemption, and HB 1645 provides TASP exemption for students from out of state or private colleges if they have taken (B or Better) courses which are on an approved list such as: History, Psychology, College Algebra, Government, or college-level English. When reviewing these documents for analyses, the researcher ran across numerous written reminders, cautions, and notes of all these inconsistencies and more. Hence, THECB is aware that weaknesses and variations abound in this data.

Having acknowledged these data inconsistencies, and being knowledgeable regarding the methods used to accumulate these data, the direction in which the data *flows* is still troubling. Given all these exceptions, conditions, and inconsistencies, the Texas Academic Skills Program clearly has not done what it was intended to do. Though the data are far from being perfect, at every juncture they point in only one direction. The most consistent thing about the data I have viewed is its consistency in showing little or no improvement of Texas' community and technical college students on TASP over the years. It is not reasonable to expect that different rules or not changing cut-off scores over the years would greatly impact these results.

If this program is too continue in any form, the THECB, college administrators, and first line professionals must move forward with new ideas and different activities. Doing new things and thinking new ways should be the battle cry, because the current program has problems and those problems appear to be systemic.

Analyses of Texas Survey Data

Survey research is the most widely form of research done in this country. The researcher is always faced with the reality that people are complex, and in many cases perceptions are more important than reality. In this study we worked vigorously to conduct a credible and meaningful survey that would yield accurate data and include a

broad spectrum of knowledgeable people. Respondents overwhelmingly supported these efforts and made it clear that the study should have been done much sooner.

While working with these respondents and before, it was obvious that more research of this type is needed to monitor progress or lack of it. The survey design seems to be well suited for this task. The majority of individuals I spoke with during this study agree that changes are needed, and that broad based collaboration is in order. Many of the respondents called or emailed me to voice concerns about the state of affairs with TASP and the so called "access and equity" movement as well as the "closing the gaps" movement. Some feel that there are inconsistencies in these messages. Each person who spoke with the researcher was advised to make responses on the survey based only on their own knowledge and perceptions.

Following are the results from the randomly submitted questionnaire sent to academic deans, counselors, and student service Deans who work closely with students and TASP and are able to respond based on their personal knowledge and perceptions. As this study does not focus on position responses the data is not separated by position, but was segregated by college type. A complete sample profile is provided in the back appendix. The results of the survey are displayed in table three below with the item typed above the results. These analyses show a descriptive array of the results as well as a Chi-square statistical analysis of item one. Item one was analyzed more closely than the other items, because, as it is worded, it summarizes the basis for this study. As the colleges were segregated by type, the Chi-square test of independence statistic was computed to determine if responses were associated with a particular type of college. For clarity and computation survey variable scaling was collapsed in the following manner. Strongly agree and agree were collapsed to mean, "agree"; and strongly disagree and disagree were collapsed to mean, "disagree." Respondents indicating they did not know were not included in the analyses. Only two respondents fall into this category for item 1 (see table 3). The collapsing of scales is commonly done with count data and should not impact computations.

It must be noted as well that the results for all scalable items (1-3) are displayed showing the applicable margin of error (7.4) at the 90% level. The percentages and proportions calculated via the draw sample are inherently pronged to some error: it is a piece of the population, not the population. Accordingly, an interval estimate of the population *parameters* is more practical than a point estimate. To this end, the researcher has calculated interval estimates of responses and included them in table 3. This was done only for the "agree" and "disagree" groups. The reader should pay attention to the proportion of respondents agreeing or disagreeing to the statement as worded. The responses for item number 1 should be particularly interesting, as respondents seem to take a more profound stand on this issue than the other two. Respondents basically agree or disagree, only two of the 123 respondents indicated they did not know if the TASP situation caused a significant problem for Texans wanting to come to college.

Table 3
Survey Results

1. The TASP test, and the rules associated with it, do not cause a significant enrollment problem for Texas students who want to come to college.

	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Tot.	Conf. Interval @ .10
Agree	13 (34.2%)	13 (43.4%)	29 (55.7%)	55 (44.7%)	37.3 -52.1
Don't Know	1	0	1	2 (1.6%)	
Disagree	27 (65.8%)	17 (56.6%)	22 (42.3%)	66 (53.7%)	46.3-61.1
	41	30	52	*123	

2. I have noticed a significant improvement in students' academic performance as a result of their having to prepare for and take the TASP test.

	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Tot.	Conf. Interval @ .10
Agree	15 (36.6%)	6 (20%)	21 (40.4%)	**42** (34.1%)	26.7-41.5
Don't Know	5	7	15	27 (21.9%)	
Disagree	21 (51.2%)	17 (56.6%)	16 (30.7%)	**54** (44 %)	36.6-51.4
	41	30	52	*123	

3. Since its beginning in 1989, the TASP test has proven to be a positive strategy to Texas' efforts toward providing quality education to all students that seek it

	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Tot	Conf. Interval @ .10
Agree	17 (41.5%)	8 (26.6%)	22 (42.3%)	**45** (36.5%)	29.1-43.9
Don't Know	5	6	9	20 (16.3%)	
Disagree	21 (51.2%)	16 (53.3%)	21 (40.3%)	**58** (47.2%)	39.8-54-6
	41	30	52	*123	

The sample results are displayed with population estimates at the 90% level with a margin of error of 7.4. The most glaring analysis appears to be associated to item one. Nearly 54% of those surveyed have indicated they disagree that this process does not cause a significant enrollment problem for students; 44.7% did not see it as a significant problem. Although overall, most respondents responded negatively in regard to TASP,

item one was the most interesting. Only two people out of 123 indicated they did not know if the TASP process was a problem. Respondents generally saw this issue from one perspective or the other; there was a clear and obvious dissension among respondents. Moreover, those working in urban schools seemed to be most negative (65.8% vs. 34.2%) about TASP causing enrollment problems for students.

As previously stated, the analyses of item one is central to the spirit of this study, and the results are so clear-cut, it warranted the additional analyses. As mentioned the chi-square test of independence was conducted ($\chi^2 = 5.92$, df = 2, significant @. .10) to determine if the results were associated to college type. The results of the 3x2 table indicated there is a significant relationship between the two responses categories (agree and disagree) and college type within this sample distribution. The 3x2 table and chi-square analyses are shown in the appendix of this paper.

Final Analysis (Item 4)

The last question in the survey provided and item, which allowed the respondent to give a brief general statement about their overall perception of TASP. Out of 123 respondents there were 122 who responded to this item. Open-ended questions are not as easily analyzed as quantifiable data, but nevertheless they do provide information. Many statements were made on the survey. Basically those statements mirrored the split in perceptions shown in questions one, two, and three. However, in spite of the differences in perceptions about TASP, one over all theme was evident. None of the respondents indicated that basic skills were not important. Each person made it clear that they believed mastery of basic skills is essential to student success in college.

So, where questions one through three showed vast differences on key points, question four indicated respondents were consistent in the belief that basic academic skills are important to our students.

Students Speak

> *"Having such a hard time with TASP, after working so hard in my developmental class made me feel I did not belong in college."*

Too often the *real* story is lost in statistical arguments, graphs, and hypotheses, but this study is about students. During this study I had the opportunity to speak with several students. These students gave the researcher complete authorization to use their names and tell their story as *mini* case studies. Case studies have long been used to obtain valuable information from individuals. Alone, these individual mini-stories do not provide much in site, but coupled with the other hard data presented here they put faces and names to data analyses. All students were simply asked to tell me about their experience with TASP.

Four of these students, whom I will call M. Skinner, R. Garcia, and I. Mims, and Ms. King spoke to me indebt about several problems they were having as a result of the TASP process. Without going in depth to great personal detail about these students, I will give

brief information about them. As with any case study, we simply randomly chose students hoping to get the "average" student.

Mr. M. Skinner is a current peace officer that is trying to go on to a university to complete a BA degree. Because of a hectic schedule he has found it very difficult to attend the developmental classes, and lost two semesters as a result. This student is the first one in his family to go to college. R. Garcia, a forty-two year old mother and first time college student in her family, is a student pursuing a career in a health profession. She indicates she missed a whole term, because the correct developmental math course was not offered at the campus she normally attends. The class was offered at another campus, but because of budgetary restraints she could not afford to drive the extra 7.5 miles to the other campus. This student advised the researcher that she though about stopping, but a counselor encouraged her to continue her studies. Ms. Garcia has indicated that the way the TASP program and college developmental plans are ran she is having great difficulty completing her studies. Ms. I. Mims is a middle-aged college student. She decided to start college at the encouragement of her daughter, who herself was a first time student. Ms. Mims has admitted weakness in math and has been taking developmental classes in that area. She was shocked and discouraged her last semester when she received a grade of "D" in her developmental class. She indicated that she was so discouraged she started to drop out, but her daughter gave her inspiration. Ms. Mims stated that she is aware she has a problem with math, and works hard and attends class regularly to better her situation. She stated, "Having such a hard time with TASP, after working so hard in my developmental class made me feel I did not belong in college". Finally, one student, whose name I have lost in the great amount of paper I have generated in this study brought out a very important point. It would be an injustice to her not to include her statement. This student was a middle-aged White woman seeking a new career. She voiced not only does TASP rules impede the progress of students at urban schools, but also for older students at all colleges. Her point was, that older students have less time to complete their studies than younger students. So taking so many developmental classes and still not passing TASP has a more severe effect on older students than those who are eighteen or nineteen years old.

These students all come from urban areas, but different colleges in the state. All are over thirty-five years old. In interviewing these students I found they all agree that developing academic skills are important to them, but the TASP program has not helped them in this. There are thousands of stories out there that could be told if someone would listen.

Developmental Plans

Finally, we will briefly cover college Developmental Plans. Recently the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board has prescribed that colleges provide a "Developmental Plan". This plan is essentially the way the college will comply with TASP guidelines, while giving them more *flexibility*. It has must be understood that these plans are a direct extension of the TASP program; hence they are part of this study. Reviewing several plans last year I found that they come in all forms; no two were exactly a like. In examining several last year it was revealed that interpretation of the guidelines in some cases, was difficult and the guidelines themselves were vague and

complex. **Maybe even more important is some college developmental plans set standards that are higher than those imposed by TASP**. The clearest example of this is in passing scores of the various tests. It is possible for a student to take an alternative TASP test at a school, pass the TASP standard, but still be tracked to developmental courses based on a school developmental plan standards. According to some counselors and other officials I interviewed, this is causing additional problems for students. And like with TASP, Texas students will pay the price once more.

Summary

The study was composed of three separate yet related levels. The researcher analyzed historical records from the Coordinating Board to determine the amount of improvement over time resulting from the TASP program. Also a survey was done that included key personnel to ascertain their perception of the TASP test and its impact on students. Finally several students were interviewed to reflect on their personal experience with TASP. As every research method has weaknesses, combining several methods helps to compensate for research design weaknesses, this method is called "Triangularzation." The triangular design was used in this study because it strengthens the validity of a study and seeks convergence of results. So, the project looks at Historical, Perception, and Qualitative factors to address the three questions found in the significance section. Data were tabulated and analyzed to provide insight necessary to address those three questions on which this investigation is based.

Findings and Conclusions

Based on the results of this study, it seems that people in Texas are comfortable with TASP or they are not, there is little middle ground. Those who seem to be comfortable with the current situation seem to opine that TASP is what we need and is doing basically what it should be doing-that is not true. The other side is of the opinion that it is extremely biased and does nothing to enhance the educational experience for students-that is not true. The real truth lies somewhere between these two extremes.

Having studied this TASP situation since 1989 I have come to some hard found realizations. I am relatively sure that in its inception TASP was intended to address the profound issues of inadequate performance of our Texas students. Policy makers and educators, in the wake of rising public concern, did the best job they could do to address that problem. To add to their woes was the rising call for accountability across the entire country. I have seen nothing during this study to lead me to suspect that there was some organized plot to single out certain groups. However, some very credible groups have suggested this and discrimination was cited as a problem in the 1996 Boylan report.

What has taken place here has happened before. A good idea has turned into a bad situation, and the servant has become the master. The TASP test, which was designed to serve us by helping Texas students, has turned into the master. We now are more concerned with compliance and rules of TASP than the student's well being, though that is not what we desire as educators.

One state report I reviewed refers to two states of unprepared students: *relative* and *absolute*. These terms are used in other areas of education, but are mostly found in social

studies and refer to levels of poverty usually, rather than education. However, based on the many factors involving Texas students' TASP performance, these terms do not provide meaningful categories. This is particularly true with the term "absolute." This suggests that no learning has taken place, and that is not the case, even with extremely low scoring students. Review of the test results of thousands of students over the years, I conclude that there are *four levels* of which these students fall. First there is level-1, or adequately prepared students. They have sufficient skills to pass all parts of TASP first time off. Next these are the level-2 students whose deficiencies are "negligible." They may not pass a part of TASP, but are very close to passing and normally do when they retake the test. Level-3 students have "relative" deficiencies compared to the two groups above them. These students may not pass one or even two parts of the test, but obviously possess the potential to quickly remediate to standards. The final category is level-4 testers. These are "severely" deficient in entry-level skills to succeed in college. This is the group that appears to be most problematic, and find themselves in prolonged remediation and taking the test on multiple occasions. Some high school counselors and other mental health professionals have stated to me that many of these students may have some form of undiagnosed learning disability; there are several other theories for this dilemma. This can not be understated.

Intervening Factors Explanations

This study, for all practical purposes is a "descriptive study." This type of research does not seek to find explanations for the subject matter under study, in this case TASP performance. Consequently, one would argue that although the data indicates poor performance, there are likely logical reasons for this that are not addressed in this study. Technically these are called spurious, confounding, moderator, or intervening variables. These could be poor faculty training, testing environment inconsistencies, problems in the way data is handled; allocation of funds for remedial education, time lapse between remedial classes and testing, whether the developmental sequence was completed, and more. I believe these are valid arguments, generally speaking. A statistical counter to this argument would be these are random variables. If these in fact are operating randomly, then some noticeable improvement should have taken place during the period studied. Given probability theory, over the long haul improvement should have been measurable if it existed.

So, we have *at least* two possible arguments here for the findings. First outcomes here are affected by intervening factors not taken into account by simply collecting data and displaying the results. Secondly, these intervening factors are operating randomly and should not cause any *systematic* influence to the measurable results of this program, which infers the observed results are a true picture. I am inclined to go with the first argument. After studying the TASP program since its inception and conducting several quantitative investigations, I have found there are various reasons for the program's results. As TASP has gone through a metamorphosis since it's beginning, it has become more difficult to measure its effectiveness. As colleges are now giving there own "Alternative TASP" tests it is questionable why the state continues the program in its current form.

To say that outside factors are influencing the outcomes of TASP does not make these results acceptable. If there are factors, which influence TASP results negatively they should be addressed, not ignored. If the program does not help to increase students' performance in the areas of reading, writing, and mathematics it is ineffective based on program objectives and the student is the one who suffers. Because schools have more control over the assessment process now, they also have a greater responsibility to monitor program effectiveness. To this end schools should now:

(A). *Point out, identify, and in some way segregate the factors that affect their program outcomes*. This is the only way the degree of influence of these factors can be determined. The types of factors will vary as a result of the many different college cultures and environments we have in Texas.

(B). *Create and provide strategies to address these impediments to accurate outcomes measures*. Procedures to identify these needs to be local and should address college-specific issues. This will take more work from institutional research departments, but will provide more accurate measures of how programs are really doing. It will allow the various colleges to fine-tune programs.

(C). Strive in every way to provide the best programs for students and the most accurate measures possible regarding program functions to stakeholders.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study the following recommendations are made by this researcher:

1. **The TASP program as it now stands should be eliminated and its name changed to reflect its close association to developmental education:** The TASP program has not done what it purported to do. Data indicates that in the present form it is causing more harm than good. It is a fact that this program is not the cause of low performance by Texas students, but it does not seem to be helping the problem. Because of the complexity of the program guidelines, there has been more focus put on policy and procedure than on outcomes, at the expense of students. It is believed by the researcher that it is essential to have some collective body or organization in place to monitor progress and assure accountability of developmental education in the state.

2. **Individual colleges must do a better job in monitoring their progress with developmental education using some common measure:** In regard to the current developmental education situation it can be argued to the degree that a developmental program is effective, it is to that degree that it's students will be successful... Because there is so little summative program evaluation done at

community and junior colleges it is hard to accurately and fairly assess how well these programs are living up to their own standards. One method used to evaluate developmental education by some colleges is looking at how well students do in college-level classes after completing the required developmental course work, this method works well at most schools, and is a logical method. To do a better job of evaluating these programs, college personnel will need to be adequately trained in research methods and be fully aware of all the possible intervening factors that may impact a program's outcome. For the current *Self-studies* conducted by many colleges to be meaningful the results and outcomes should be compared to some relative measure or measures. Finally, cohort studies should not be used to make general statements about all students at a college or students statewide.

3. **College Developmental plans should be monitored for fairness, equity, and Compatibility:** These plans would serve the student better if there were common threads running through them all, which are focused on all Texas students, not just those at a particular college. For example, as all faculty teaching in this state must have certain credentials and maintain certain standards, all developmental course work should be accepted across the board by all colleges-this is done for most core courses currently. Moreover, there should be a student *"hold harmless"* statement issued by the state relative to these new developmental plans. This would simply state that no developmental plan should require a standard for students higher than that required by the state (in this case by the TASP program). This thereby holds students harmless as a result of the state allowing local colleges to create their own plans. Doing this would help to assure that students will not be burdened more than they already are. As the TASP test has been established as a standardized instrument with acceptable validity and reliability and the several alternative-TASP tests have been shown to statistically compare favorably with the TASP test, colleges do not have to re-invent the wheel-the work has already been done for them by qualified professionals.

4. **The distinct differences between Urban, Suburban, and Rural community and Junior colleges should be acknowledged:** It is clear that there are important differences between these colleges, the research has shown that. These differences are not solely related to the physical location of these colleges, but other factors. suburban colleges normally are populated by students coming from suburban school districts with vast resources and higher scores on standardized tests (i.e. TASP, TAAS, SAT, ACT). In addition they are largely white and most have middle to upper middle-class parents. On the other hand urban colleges are traditionally heavily populated by minorities coming from poorer inner-city school districts, and families have less resources and education. Rural colleges have other characteristics that set them apart on several important characteristics. The point here is there are many social dynamics that are present at some colleges and not present at others. In other words, all things are not equal. When segregated by type, the data shows that suburban colleges as a group out perform the two other groups on TASP performance. Also, the survey data further indicated that

urban students may be getting the worst of it when looking at the effects of TASP. These findings are identical to the 1996 study done by this researcher in showing distinct differences between these colleges. Though all Texas students have the potential to be successful, they do not all start at the same point when entering college. It is time that these differences are brought into the decision making process at all levels.

References

Babbie, E.R. (1973). *Survey Research Methods.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth

Borg, W. & Gall, M. (1989). Educational Research: An Introduction, (5th Ed.) New York, NY: Longman.

Boylan, H. (1996), Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Report.

Boylan, H. (1998), Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Report.

Ferguson, G.A. (1981). Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education (5th Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill

High, C. (2001). Evaluating Remedial Programs. Nontraditional Student Report 3 (5), 1, 5, 7.

High, C. (1997). The Texas Study: A Regression Analysis of Selected Factors that Influence the Scores of Students on the TASP Test. Eric (ED 408002).

High, C. (1999). Measuring Success in Texas Urban Community Colleges: What should the Indicators Be? Eric (ED 430589).

Sudman, S. (1976). Applied Sampling. New York: Academic Press.

Appendix Section

This section includes:

1. Chi-Square Analysis for item 1
2. Copy of Survey
3. Examples of Survey Responses
4. Examples of THECB documents used in this study
5. List of community, technical, and junior colleges contacted for this study
6. Sample profile

Chi-Square Analysis

1. The TASP test, and the rules associated with it, do not cause a significant enrollment problem for Texas students who want to come to college.

	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Tot.	Conf. Interval
Agree	13 (34.2%)	13 (43.4%)	29 (55.7%)	55 (44.7%)	37.3 -52.1
Disagree	27 (65.8%)	17 (56.6%)	22 (42.3%)	66 (53.7%)	46.3-61.1
Totals	41	30	52	*123	

Chi-square critical = 4.60 , Chi-square observed = 5.92, sig. @ .10, two-tailed prob.

From:

To: "'Clennis High'" <HIGH_C@hccs.cc.tx.us>

CC:

Sent: 09/13/2001 03:48 PM

Subject: RE: Quick Survey

Clennis, here's my response;
(1).E
(2).D
(3).C
(4).I wish I had purchased "stock" with the company that is selling the TASP. They are the only ones who are profiting from it.

PS. Check your spelling on the TSP questionnaire.

-----Original Message-----
From: Clennis High [mailto:HIGH_C@hccs.cc.tx.us]
Sent: Thursday, September 13, 2001 1:42 PM
To:

Cc:

Subject: Quick Survey

Hello Guys, hope you're not to busy with registration, we are just about done here at Houston Comminity College. My name is Clennis High, I am a counselor here at HCC, some of you may know me. I have attached a 4-item survey, I would really appreciate it if you would take five minutes to complete it for me. You don't have to send the attachment, just send me a reply showing your selections for each question (i.e.1b,2d,3a,etc) and write a statement to addess item number (4). I know it is hard to use just one statement to convey your thoughts about TASP, but please try. You can contact me in afew weeks for the results if you're interested. I am trying to get a feel for how we feel about TASP. I will be sending this survey out to about fourty colleges across the state.

Clennis
High_C@hccs.cc.tx.us

From:

To: "'Clennis High'" <HIGH_C@hccs.cc.tx.us>

CC:

Sent: 10/24/2001 02:10 PM

Subject: RE: "What is Your input"

TASP Q's responses

1. D
2. D
3. D
4. I have been a chief student affairs officer in three community colleges in three states over the last 18 years and have not found anything close to the barrier that the TASP test presents for community college students. It is apparent that the community colleges had little or no voice in the selection of this instrument as an entrance pre-test.

RDS

-----Original Message-----
From: Clennis High [mailto:HIGH_C@hccs.cc.tx.us]
Sent: Wednesday, October 24, 2001 9:26 AM
To: ronald.d.shade@nhmccd.edu
Subject: "What is Your input"

Hello . ... , I am Clennis High, counselor at Houston Community College.This is a follow up to a TASP survey sent out by me about one month ago. I am trying hard to get a representative sample regarding perceptions of counselors, advisors, and some academicians about TASP. The survey has been sent across the state; it is my intention not to leave out colleges in any part of the state. Many schools are often left out in some surveys. I will later be calling each selected respondent to be sure they did get this emailand had a chance to respond.

I have attached the four item survey, which takes 2.5 minutes to complete. Just send me a reply indicating your responses (i.e.1e,2a,3e,etc) and write a one sentence response below it for item four. Thanks for your time, and if you are iterested in the results just send me an email. All participants will get the results if they like.

Thanks,

Clennis

From:

To: "Clennis High" <HIGH_C@hccs.cc.tx.us>

CC:

Sent: 09/14/2001 02:09 PM

Subject: Re: Quick Survey

Clennis,
I would like to see the results of your survey. Thanks.

Austin Community College

My answers: 1E, 2A, 3B
4. While I support the spirit of TASP and its mission, I am continually frustrated with widerange methods of enforcing TASP by various colleges; the lack of resources to offer the number of needed developmental courses, causing students to not register at all; the lack of computer support to block registration in courses not appropriate for the student; and the HUGE strain that is put on our offices to advise students, nonstop, for 2 months straight during our peak periods, resulting in 2-3 hour waits, at times, for students.

----- Original Message -----
From: "Clennis High" <HIGH_C@hccs.cc.tx.us>
To: <mlevett@austin.cc.tx.us>; <amberk@austin.cc.tx.us>; <amcneely@austin.cc.tx.us>; <srison@austin.cc.tx.us>
Cc: <lindamoe@austin.cc.tx.us>; <denisea@austin.cc.tx.us>; <wcooper@austin.cc.tx.us>
Sent: Thursday, September 13, 2001 12:20 PM
Subject: Quick Survey

Hello Guys, hope you're not to busy with registration, we are just about done here at Houston Comminity College. My name is Clennis High, I am a counselor here at HCC, some of you may know me. I have attached a 4-item survey, I would really appreciate it if you would take five minutes to complete it for me. You don't have to send the attachment, just send me a reply showing your selections for each question (i.e.1b,2d,3a,etc) and write a statement to addess item number (4). I know it is hard to use just one statement to convey your thoughts about TASP, but please try. You can contact me in afew weeks for the results if you're interested. I am trying to get a feel for how we feel about TASP. I will be sending this survey out to about fourty colleges across the state.

Clennis
High_C@hccs.cc.tx.us

TASP QUESTIONNAIRE

As you know the TASP test is required for all students entering public colleges and universities in Texas unless they are somehow exempt. This questionnaire seeks to measure your perception of how students are affected by this state mandated test. Please check only one response per item. Simply reply on email your chose for each of the three items, and write your one sentence statement at the end (i.e. 1a, 2d 3e) then write out your statement for number (4).

(1). The Tasp test, and the rules associated with it, do not cause a significant enrollment problem for Texas students who want to come to college.

A. strongly agree, B. agree, C. don't know, D. disagree, E. strongly disagree

(2). I have noticed a significant improvement in students' academic performance as a result of their having to prepare for and take the TASP test.

A. strongly agree, B. agree, C. don't know, D. disagree, E. strongly disagree

(3). Since it's beginning in 1989, the TASP test has proven to be a positive strategy to Texas' efforts toward providing quality education to all students that seek it.

A. strongly agree, B. agree, C. don't know, D. disagree, E. strongly disagree

(4). <u>If given one sentence to do it</u>, what statement would you make about the TASP test?

_____

_____

_____

This table shows the number of survey respondents from each type of College

Sample profile

	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Number of Respondents	41	30	52	Tot. = 123

*Sample consist of counselors, advisors, and deans

(n = 123)

Section I

OVERVIEW OF THE TASP TEST

Purpose of the Program

A major impetus for the development of the Texas Academic Skills Program (TASP) was *A Generation of Failure: The Case for Testing and Remediation in Texas Higher Education*, a report prepared by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) in July 1986. This report called attention to the problem of underpreparedness in academic skills of many Texas college students—a problem common in higher education across the country. In response to this report, the Texas legislature mandated Texas Education Code (TEC) 51.306 in spring 1987, which called for the development and implementation of a basic skills test.

The THECB, the Texas Education Agency (TEA), and National Evaluation Systems, Inc. (NES®), worked together to create a basic skills test, the TASP Test, in order to provide information about the reading, mathematics, and writing skills of students entering Texas public colleges and universities and educator preparation programs in public and private institutions. As part of the TASP program, colleges and universities are required to offer their students advisory and support services related to the TASP Test.

Test Development Process

The TASP skills and item specifications were developed and approved by committees of Texas faculty from community colleges and universities. The skills were validated in surveys of Texas educators and were finalized for testing by the test development committees. Committees reviewed and validated test items. The test items were pilot tested in Texas and finalized by the committees based on pilot test results. Independent panels of Texas higher education faculty reviewed and revalidated the items and provided input to the THECB and the State Board of Education for use in setting passing standards. These boards are responsible by law for setting the passing standards. The test development committees are summarized below.

Content Advisory Committees. The THECB and the TEA jointly established a Content Advisory Committee for each of the three basic skill areas (reading, mathematics, and writing). Each committee had approximately 30 members, all of whom were Texas college or university faculty members. Faculty were selected for their expertise in their content areas and to reflect the diversity of Texas colleges and universities.

Bias Review Panel. A separate panel of approximately 30 educators specifically addressed the issue of test fairness to students in Texas in relation to sex, ethnicity, race, geographic region, handicapping conditions, or other factors.

Texas Academic Skills Program (TASP)
Summary of TASP/Alternative Test Results
Academic Year 1998-99

Center for College Readiness
Division of Educational Partnerships
Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board

Note:

In 1997, the Texas Legislature authorized the use of alternative tests for TASP purposes effective fall 1998. The Coordinating Board (CB) approved four such tests: ASSET and COMPASS from ACT; and MAPS and ACCUPLACER from The College Board. ASSET and MAPS are paper/pencil exams while COMPASS and ACCUPLACER are computer-adaptive tests.

CB staff initially set passing standards for the alternative tests by examining test results from students who had taken both the TASP Test and an alternative test within a relatively short time period.

This report provides the first look at the impact of alternative test passing standards on initial testing of first time entering students in public institutions of higher education. The data show that pass rates by test route differ, in some cases significantly. Such dissimilarities may be the result of factors like differences in student populations tested and/or in the skills being measured by each test. The CB has informed the testing companies about the first-year results and will continue to monitor the pass rates over the next year.

Meanwhile, any questions regarding the pass rates or the alternative tests should be directed to the CB's Center for College Readiness at (512) 483-6330.

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age, or disability in employment or the provision of services.

Special Alert

Required changes to the CBM002 Data Dictionary were extensive for the 1998-99 academic year. These changes may have contributed to data collection and reporting errors from institutions to the Coordinating Board. If your institution believes that such errors exist in your data in this report, please contact the agency's Academic Information Services at (512) 483-6300 or the Center for College Readiness at (512) 483-6330.

Texas Public Community and Technical Colleges
Outcome 04: Percentage of Remedial Students Who Pass TASP
(Number of CTC Students Receiving Remediation and Passing Third Subject in Fiscal Year)

Institution	FY 2000			FY 1999			FY 1998		
	Taking Remediation	Passing	Percent Passing	Taking Remediation	Passing	Percent Passing	Taking Remediation	Passing	Percent Passing
Northeast Texas Comm College	535	98	18.3	455	57	12.5	266	63	21.88
N. Harris Montgomery Coll Dist	8,749	667	7.9	6,055	803	13.3	7,188	1,156	16.08
[redacted]	1,833	245	15	1,810	269	16.7	1,026	61	5.95
Panola College	392	42	10.7	375	49	13.1	402	108	26.87
Paris Junior College	1,219	125	10.3	1,302	198	15.2	192	34	17.71
Ranger College	272	30	11	330	42	12.7	380	78	21.11
San Jacinto College District	4,615	298	6.5	4,824	1,375	28.5	4,278	499	11.66
South Plains College	1,755	155	8.8	2,201	476	21.6	1,254	267	21.29
South Texas Community College	5,273	409	7.8	4,064	122	3	3,264	272	8.33
Southwest Texas Junior College	2,013	301	15	2,051	317	15.5	1,824	174	9.54
[redacted]	11,000	1,141	10.4	11,160	1,669	15	5,681	824	14.5
Temple College	685	68	9.9	663	40	6	758	178	23.48
[redacted]	594	120	20.2	562	131	23.3	708	211	29.8
Texas Southmost College	3,160	475	14.9	3,171	397	12.5	3,675	590	16.05
Texas State T.C. Harlingen	1,839	277	15.1	1,643	242	14.7	1,656	348	21.01
Texas State T.C. Sweetwater	575	63	11	420	71	16.9	319	110	34.48
[redacted]	1,797	233	13	2,068	288	13.9	1,969	437	22.19
Trinity Valley Comm College	1,154	185	16	1,206	126	10.4	530	152	28.68
Tyler Junior College	2,227	431	19.4	2,011	143	7.1	1,271	272	21.4
Vernon Regional Junior College	326	33	10.1	306	35	11.4	381	98	26.59
[redacted]	1,011	139	13.7	1,002	275	27.4	823	165	20.05
Weatherford College	709	116	16.4	722	195	27	561	161	28.7
Western Texas College	333	25	7.5	379	70	18.5	333	71	21.32
Wharton County Junior College	1,121	188	16.8	1,083	285	26.3	934	142	15.2
Statewide Totals	167,165	15,836	9.47%	142,518	17,733	12.44%	116,600	15,961	13.69%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

All Routes Test Pass Rates - Initial Attempt
Academic Year 1999-2000
Community and Technical Colleges

Institution	Whites Tested	Percent Passing	Blacks Tested	Percent Passing	Hispanics Tested	Percent Passing	Asians Tested	Percent Passing	Others Tested	Percent Passing	Total Tested	Percent Passing	Number Exempted
NORTH CENTRAL TEXAS COLLEGE	1,258	40.5%	69	27.5%	108	31.5%	37	29.7%	42	33.3%	1,514	38.8%	389
NORTHEAST TEXAS COMM COLLEGE	514	25.3%	47	6.4%	32	9.4%	8	50.0%	1	0.0%	602	23.3%	205
ODESSA COLLEGE	482	29.0%	73	12.3%	351	16.2%	7	42.9%	8	25.0%	921	22.9%	308
PALO ALTO COLLEGE	679	37.8%	76	22.4%	1,613	18.4%	25	44.0%	16	50.0%	2,409	24.4%	296
PANOLA COLLEGE	332	39.5%	86	14.0%	16	11.1%	1	0.0%	3	66.7%	440	33.4%	199
PARIS JUNIOR COLLEGE	564	25.2%	104	9.6%	25	0.0%	8	50.0%	12	16.7%	713	22.2%	254
RANGER COLLEGE	263	36.9%	96	8.3%	68	35.3%	2	50.0%	8	37.5%	437	30.4%	130
SAN ANTONIO COLLEGE	2,515	32.0%	282	23.4%	3,533	20.5%	137	21.2%	112	23.2%	6,579	25.1%	1,275
SAN JACINTO COLLEGE CEN CAMPUS	317	38.8%	24	33.3%	180	30.0%	27	37.0%	33	24.2%	581	34.9%	369
SAN JACINTO COLLEGE N CAMPUS	84	25.0%	69	14.5%	98	12.2%	4	75.0%	9	33.3%	264	18.6%	138
SAN JACINTO COLLEGE S CAMPUS	195	47.7%	61	31.1%	73	26.0%	42	47.6%	44	22.7%	415	38.8%	348
SOUTH PLAINS COLLEGE	1,202	40.3%	114	11.4%	532	21.8%	15	40.0%	10	50.0%	1,873	33.4%	667
SOUTH TEXAS COMMUNITY COLLEGE	122	23.8%	3	0.0%	3,204	13.8%	14	14.3%	13	23.1%	3,356	14.2%	523
SOUTHWEST COLLEGIATE INSTITUTE	8	12.5%	0	0.0%	3	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11	18.2%	1
SOUTHWEST TEXAS JUNIOR COLLEGE	279	24.0%	40	17.5%	814	12.0%	7	28.6%	12	25.0%	1,152	15.4%	146
ST. PHILIP'S COLLEGE	754	28.4%	511	17.6%	1,534	15.4%	49	28.6%	18	27.8%	2,866	19.5%	347
TARRANT CO NORTHEAST CAMPUS	1,668	18.2%	149	4.0%	189	11.1%	86	17.4%	28	17.9%	2,120	16.5%	596
TARRANT CO NORTHWEST CAMPUS	687	17.9%	34	5.9%	271	12.2%	30	23.3%	12	8.3%	1,034	16.1%	298
TARRANT CO SOUTH CAMPUS	886	18.5%	482	7.7%	292	6.8%	51	11.8%	19	0.0%	1,730	13.1%	411
TARRANT CO SOUTHEAST CAMPUS	1,343	33.3%	340	14.4%	232	15.5%	179	19.6%	28	25.0%	2,122	27.0%	451
TEMPLE COLLEGE	680	42.4%	100	17.0%	128	28.1%	6	16.7%	8	50.0%	922	37.5%	343
TEXARKANA COLLEGE	326	29.8%	96	9.4%	7	28.6%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	430	25.1%	140
TEXAS SOUTHMOST COLLEGE	59	32.2%	1	0.0%	1,780	13.2%	7	0.0%	10	20.0%	1,857	13.8%	355
TEXAS STATE T. C. MARSHALL	147	29.3%	61	6.6%	9	11.1%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	219	22.8%	6
TEXAS STATE T.C. HARLINGEN	142	28.2%	4	0.0%	1,079	16.5%	5	20.0%	0	0.0%	1,230	17.8%	0
TEXAS STATE T.C. SWEETWATER	347	21.6%	10	20.0%	94	12.8%	4	25.0%	3	0.0%	458	19.7%	42
TEXAS STATE T.C. WACO	1,005	20.4%	201	3.0%	189	15.3%	6	16.7%	8	25.0%	1,409	17.2%	86
TRINITY VALLEY COMM COLLEGE	1,007	28.5%	267	10.9%	93	22.6%	11	27.3%	34	14.7%	1,412	24.4%	365
TYLER JUNIOR COLLEGE	1,178	26.5%	491	8.6%	99	9.1%	12	16.7%	16	31.3%	1,796	20.6%	516
VERNON REGIONAL JUNIOR COLLEGE	432	29.6%	34	11.8%	68	14.7%	5	20.0%	16	31.3%	555	26.7%	116
VICTORIA COLLEGE, THE	527	31.9%	42	7.1%	299	21.7%	14	50.0%	8	25.0%	890	27.5%	403
WEATHERFORD COLLEGE	940	35.3%	29	6.9%	59	22.0%	9	22.2%	59	33.9%	1,096	33.7%	268
WESTERN TEXAS COLLEGE	276	37.0%	34	20.6%	70	21.4%	5	20.0%	5	40.0%	390	32.6%	211
WHARTON COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE	1,049	56.6%	191	33.0%	357	41.7%	78	59.0%	16	50.0%	1,691	50.9%	538
All CTC Institutions	**59,231**	**32.7%**	**15,383**	**13.1%**	**35,291**	**17.2%**	**3,979**	**25.7%**	**3,356**	**24.0%**	**117,240**	**25.0%**	**25,282**
										All Routes Pass Rate with CTC Exemptions:		***38.3%***	
All Institutions	**80,361**	**39.6%**	**22,413**	**18.1%**	**47,060**	**23.7%**	**6,087**	**33.0%**	**5,418**	**28.0%**	**161,339**	**31.4%**	**56,067**
										All Routes Pass Rate with Exemptions:		***49.1%***	

Data Resources for the 2001 LBB Performance Measures

Texas Public Community and Technical Colleges

Outcome 04: Percentage of Remedial Students Who Pass TASP

(Number of CTC Students Receiving Remediation and Passing Third Subject in Fiscal Year)

Institution	FY 2000			FY 1999			FY 1998		
	Taking Remediation	Passing	Percent Passing	Taking Remediation	Passing	Percent Passing	Taking Remediation	Passing	Percent Passing
Northeast Texas Comm College	535	98	18.3	455	57	12.5	288	63	21.88
N. Harris Montgomery Coll Dist	8,749	687	7.9	6,055	803	13.3	7,188	1,156	16.08
[redacted]	1,833	245	15	1,610	269	16.7	1,026	61	5.95
Panola College	392	42	10.7	375	49	13.1	402	108	26.87
Paris Junior College	1,219	125	10.3	1,302	198	15.2	192	34	17.71
Ranger College	272	30	11	330	42	12.7	360	76	21.11
San Jacinto College District	4,615	298	6.5	4,824	1,375	28.5	4,278	499	11.66
South Plains College	1,755	155	8.8	2,201	476	21.6	1,254	267	21.29
South Texas Community College	5,273	409	7.8	4,064	122	3	3,264	272	8.33
Southwest Texas Junior College	2,013	301	15	2,051	317	15.5	1,824	174	9.54
[redacted]	11,000	1,141	10.4	11,160	1,669	15	5,681	824	14.5
Temple College	685	68	9.9	683	40	6	758	178	23.48
[redacted]	594	120	20.2	562	131	23.3	708	211	29.8
Texas Southmost College	3,180	475	14.9	3,171	397	12.5	3,675	590	16.05
Texas State T.C. Harlingen	1,839	277	15.1	1,843	242	14.7	1,656	348	21.01
Texas State T.C. Sweetwater	575	63	11	420	71	16.9	319	110	34.48
[redacted]	1,797	233	13	2,068	288	13.9	1,969	437	22.19
Trinity Valley Comm College	1,154	185	16	1,206	126	10.4	530	152	28.68
Tyler Junior College	2,227	431	19.4	2,011	143	7.1	1,271	272	21.4
Vernon Regional Junior College	328	33	10.1	306	35	11.4	361	96	26.59
[redacted]	1,011	139	13.7	1,002	275	27.4	823	165	20.05
Weatherford College	709	116	16.4	722	195	27	561	161	28.7
Western Texas College	333	25	7.5	379	70	18.5	333	71	21.32
Wharton County Junior College	1,121	188	16.8	1,083	285	26.3	934	142	15.2
Statewide Totals	167,165	15,838	9.47%	142,518	17,733	12.44%	116,600	15,961	13.69%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TASP Test Pass Rates - Retake Attempts
Academic Year 1998-99
Community and Technical Colleges

Institution	Whites Tested	Percent Passing	Blacks Tested	Percent Passing	Hispanics Tested	Percent Passing	Asians Tested	Percent Passing	Others Tested	Percent Passing	Total Tested	Percent Passing
ALAMO CCD NW VISTA COLLEGE	44	34.1%	5	0.0%	61	42.6%	3	100.0%	0	0.0%	113	38.9%
ALVIN COMMUNITY COLLEGE	275	10.5%	48	0.0%	94	5.3%	10	0.0%	2	0.0%	427	8.0%
AMARILLO COLLEGE	129	33.3%	11	18.2%	48	22.9%	16	0.0%	2	0.0%	206	27.2%
ANGELINA COLLEGE	48	75.0%	5	80.0%	5	20.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	59	69.5%
AUSTIN COMMUNITY COLLEGE	2419	79.4%	325	61.2%	1163	72.2%	447	57.9%	146	67.1%	4500	73.7%
BLINN COLLEGE	2402	30.6%	533	8.8%	422	20.6%	38	18.4%	139	23.7%	3534	25.7%
BRAZOSPORT COLLEGE	129	6.2%	15	6.7%	48	6.3%	3	0.0%	4	0.0%	199	6.0%
CENTRAL TEXAS COLLEGE	520	64.6%	259	51.7%	188	53.2%	76	48.7%	47	55.3%	1090	58.1%
CISCO JUNIOR COLLEGE	22	31.8%	9	33.3%	6	16.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	37	29.7%
CLARENDON COLLEGE	181	31.5%	28	17.9%	28	21.4%	1	0.0%	6	0.0%	244	27.9%
COASTAL BEND COLLEGE	228	0.4%	60	0.0%	615	0.2%	2	0.0%	4	0.0%	909	0.2%
COLLEGE OF THE MAINLAND	91	7.7%	42	4.8%	26	0.0%	6	33.3%	0	0.0%	165	6.7%
COLLIN CO COMM COLL DISTRICT	610	3.1%	76	3.9%	77	3.9%	128	2.3%	16	0.0%	907	3.1%
DCCCD BROOKHAVEN COLLEGE	380	8.9%	103	2.9%	154	3.2%	90	4.4%	35	14.3%	762	6.7%
DCCCD CEDAR VALLEY COLLEGE	76	5.3%	176	2.8%	25	8.0%	0	0.0%	3	33.3%	280	4.3%
DCCCD EASTFIELD COLLEGE	550	6.9%	256	3.1%	244	2.0%	98	8.2%	14	0.0%	1162	5.1%
DCCCD EL CENTRO COLLEGE	60	5.0%	252	2.0%	117	6.8%	17	11.8%	20	25.0%	466	4.9%
DCCCD MOUNTAIN VIEW COLLEGE	148	11.5%	247	3.6%	283	5.7%	46	0.0%	9	0.0%	733	5.7%
DCCCD NORTH LAKE COLLEGE	278	5.4%	80	1.2%	116	1.7%	112	7.1%	52	11.5%	638	5.0%
DCCCD RICHLAND COLLEGE	528	11.6%	262	5.3%	209	7.7%	278	5.4%	121	10.7%	1398	8.5%
DEL MAR COLLEGE	972	63.5%	37	43.2%	1549	52.3%	43	48.5%	27	25.9%	2628	55.9%
EL PASO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DIST	507	10.1%	136	2.2%	5812	7.0%	35	5.7%	276	13.4%	6566	7.4%
FRANK PHILLIPS COLLEGE	58	22.4%	4	0.0%	10	10.0%	2	50.0%	7	57.1%	81	23.5%
GALVESTON COLLEGE	44	54.5%	40	17.5%	29	41.4%	1	100.0%	5	40.0%	119	38.7%
GRAYSON COUNTY COLLEGE	15	80.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	16	81.3%
HILL COLLEGE	81	63.0%	6	33.3%	10	70.0%	1	100.0%	10	20.0%	108	58.3%
HOUSTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE	1809	68.2%	2441	44.4%	2389	52.2%	2044	52.7%	156	53.8%	8839	53.5%
HOWARD COLLEGE	346	48.3%	46	26.1%	150	41.3%	8	25.0%	2	50.0%	552	44.2%
KILGORE COLLEGE	22	72.7%	12	58.3%	5	80.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	39	69.2%
LAMAR INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY	281	42.3%	141	23.4%	24	33.3%	11	27.3%	3	66.7%	460	35.9%
LAMAR-ORANGE	198	5.6%	46	0.0%	8	0.0%	1	0.0%	1	0.0%	254	4.3%
LAMAR-PORT ARTHUR	242	23.6%	161	11.8%	31	3.2%	37	13.5%	4	50.0%	475	17.7%
LAREDO COMMUNITY COLLEGE	5	20.0%	2	0.0%	456	4.2%	2	0.0%	4	0.0%	469	4.3%
LEE COLLEGE	40	17.5%	16	18.8%	10	20.0%	1	0.0%	5	20.0%	72	18.1%
MCLENNAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE	664	30.3%	198	9.1%	145	16.6%	24	8.3%	32	21.9%	1063	23.7%
MIDLAND COLLEGE	10	60.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	13	53.8%
NAVARRO COLLEGE	291	27.5%	110	7.3%	42	23.8%	50	8.0%	34	5.9%	527	19.7%
NHMCCCD KINGWOOD COLLEGE	520	57.5%	41	39.0%	72	50.0%	8	87.5%	8	37.5%	649	55.6%
NHMCCCD MONTGOMERY COLLEGE	594	59.1%	37	35.1%	77	42.9%	14	42.9%	5	100.0%	727	56.1%
NHMCCCD NORTH HARRIS COLLEGE	653	59.9%	293	39.9%	376	54.8%	272	38.6%	31	51.6%	1625	51.4%
NHMCCCD TOMBALL COLLEGE	683	57.5%	31	35.5%	67	70.1%	18	61.1%	5	20.0%	804	57.6%
NORTH CENTRAL TEXAS COLLEGE	34	64.7%	2	50.0%	3	100.0%	2	50.0%	4	25.0%	45	62.2%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Passing All Three Sections of TASP Test
Academic Year 1996 - 1997

Community and Technical Colleges

Institution	Whites Number Tested	Whites Percent Passing	Blacks Number Tested	Blacks Percent Passing	Hispanics Number Tested	Hispanics Percent Passing	Asians Number Tested	Asians Percent Passing	Others Number Tested	Others Percent Passing	Totals Number Tested	Percent Pass Number Exempted	Percent Pass Without Exemptions
Alvin Community College	615	49.6%	40	30.0%	146	43.2%	19	42.1%	11	45.5%	831	93	47.3%
Amarillo College	914	60.1%	36	36.1%	201	48.3%	62	33.9%	18	27.8%	1,231	158	55.6%
Angelina College	809	39.6%	141	22.7%	66	34.8%	<6	25.0%	10	30.0%	1,030	93	36.8%
Austin Community College	2,601	62.8%	255	36.9%	837	47.1%	518	28.8%	199	46.2%	4,410	350	53.6%
Blinn College	1,761	53.0%	278	20.5%	245	45.3%	43	41.9%	124	27.4%	2,451	562	47.0%
Brazosport College	406	59.9%	42	40.5%	118	47.5%	20	40.0%	<6	20.0%	591	141	55.0%
Brookhaven College	726	58.8%	119	26.1%	214	40.7%	270	32.6%	66	48.5%	1,395	216	47.7%
Cedar Valley College	220	51.8%	234	25.6%	55	38.2%	<6	50.0%	<6	50.0%	513	54	38.4%
Central Texas College	708	54.8%	255	31.4%	172	46.5%	105	40.0%	118	22.9%	1,358	143	45.4%
Cisco Junior College	533	44.5%	83	19.3%	100	39.0%	<6	40.0%	8	62.5%	729	44	41.0%
Clarendon College	308	35.4%	22	22.7%	33	24.2%	<6	50.0%	<6	33.3%	370	1	33.5%
Coastal Bend College	302	50.3%	27	25.9%	535	26.2%	<6	20.0%	<6	75.0%	873	124	34.7%
College of the Mainland	468	52.4%	122	33.6%	126	30.2%	31	45.2%	6	66.7%	753	25	45.4%
Collin County Community College	1,654	54.7%	106	40.6%	180	40.6%	149	35.6%	57	52.6%	2,126		51.5%
Del Mar College	934	53.0%	46	41.3%	1,146	38.5%	40	35.0%	51	37.3%	2,217	200	44.6%
Eastfield College	939	49.0%	267	18.4%	267	36.0%	264	21.6%	31	25.8%	1,768	150	37.9%
El Centro College	150	40.0%	315	29.2%	143	31.5%	31	38.7%	14	35.7%	653	8	32.8%
El Paso Community College	487	47.4%	84	24.5%	3,701	29.2%	33	42.4%	80	32.5%	4,395		31.3%

Passing All Three Sections of TASP Test
Academic Year 1995 - 1996

Community and Technical Colleges

Institution	Whites Number Tested	Percent Passing	Blacks Number Tested	Percent Passing	Hispanics Number Tested	Percent Passing	Asians Number Tested	Percent Passing	Others Number Tested	Percent Passing	Totals Number Tested	Percent Pass Number Exempted	Percent Pass Without Exemptions
Alvin Community College	601	44.4%	47	25.5%	141	34.0%	34	35.3%	13	15.4%	836	55	40.8%
Amarillo College	687	58.8%	26	34.6%	159	40.3%	41	43.9%	17	52.9%	930	61	54.2%
Angelina College	769	42.5%	152	21.7%	71	29.6%	<6	100.0%	9	22.2%	1,024	58	38.5%
Austin Community College	2,508	61.7%	227	41.9%	773	46.8%	512	26.2%	275	35.6%	4,295	272	52.1%
Bee County College	271	46.1%	33	21.2%	405	25.9%	7	57.1%	8	50.0%	724	65	33.8%
Blinn College	1,414	51.4%	248	19.0%	197	44.7%	30	43.3%	184	31.5%	2,073	3	45.0%
Brazosport College	383	61.1%	18	50.0%	89	45.5%	9	22.2%	<6	0.0%	513	97	58.5%
Brookhaven College	861	55.3%	107	33.6%	231	44.2%	228	25.9%	40	52.5%	1,467	126	47.3%
Cedar Valley College	243	44.9%	268	28.7%	53	43.4%	<6	33.3%	7	14.3%	574	42	36.8%
Central Texas College	588	54.9%	208	31.3%	140	42.1%	82	27.2%	91	25.3%	1,119	141	44.2%
Cisco Junior College	494	41.7%	94	18.1%	102	27.5%	9	11.1%	12	25.0%	622	23	41.0%
Clarendon College	291	38.5%	21	19.0%	34	29.4%	<6	25.0%	<6	50.0%	352	6	36.4%
College of the Mainland	416	46.3%	98	31.3%	78	29.5%	27	29.6%	9	55.6%	628	35	42.7%
Collin County Community College	1,733	55.6%	92	22.8%	164	43.3%	143	32.9%	19	52.6%	2,151	2	51.7%
Del Mar College	860	49.4%	39	20.5%	1,065	36.3%	30	43.3%	40	22.5%	2,034	158	41.4%
Eastfield College	1,069	47.4%	218	21.6%	245	35.9%	278	18.3%	30	26.7%	1,840	100	38.1%
El Centro College	151	35.8%	308	19.8%	164	34.1%	31	12.9%	22	31.8%	676	7	26.9%
El Paso Community College	424	47.4%	89	36.0%	3,479	28.3%	51	23.5%	29	62.1%	4,072	0	30.6%

Passing All Three Sections of TASP Test
Academic Year 1994 - 1995

Community and Technical Colleges

Institution	Whites Number Tested	Whites Percent Passing	Blacks Number Tested	Blacks Percent Passing	Hispanics Number Tested	Hispanics Percent Passing	Asians Number Tested	Asians Percent Passing	Others Number Tested	Others Percent Passing	Totals Number Tested	Number Exempted	Percent Pass Without Exemptions
Alvin Community College	528	56.6%	40	42.5%	107	48.6%	27	22.2%	<6	0.0%	706	22	53.0%
Amarillo College	737	68.0%	49	30.6%	161	54.7%	45	51.1%	23	47.8%	1,015	74	62.9%
Angelina College	768	52.1%	183	26.8%	54	53.7%	7	71.4%	6	16.7%	1,018	23	47.5%
Austin Community College	2,280	70.4%	204	45.6%	661	52.2%	438	24.9%	284	31.7%	3,867	246	58.0%
Bee County College	251	56.2%	35	22.9%	411	29.2%	10	50.0%	13	46.2%	720	53	38.9%
Blinn College	1,378	62.6%	250	19.2%	227	50.7%	36	36.1%	132	31.1%	2,023	0	53.4%
Brazosport College	382	63.9%	27	63.0%	102	51.0%	11	27.3%	<6	0.0%	524	52	60.3%
Brookhaven College	869	58.9%	153	31.4%	215	46.5%	281	30.2%	50	36.0%	1,568	67	48.7%
Cedar Valley College	277	58.1%	242	31.0%	46	43.5%	<6	66.7%	<6	0.0%	570	28	45.3%
Central Texas College	724	59.9%	209	34.9%	181	48.6%	68	44.1%	108	19.4%	1,290	41	50.1%
Cisco Junior College	436	53.4%	102	15.7%	76	28.9%	<6	0.0%	<6	100.0%	622	4	44.1%
Clarendon College	286	45.1%	25	20.0%	35	22.9%	<6	50.0%	<6	100.0%	349	7	41.3%
College of the Mainland	427	60.0%	85	30.6%	87	57.5%	28	32.1%	13	15.4%	640	0	53.6%
Collin County Community College	1,700	62.7%	93	33.3%	116	52.6%	125	43.2%	21	71.4%	2,055	67	59.7%
Del Mar College	826	59.1%	39	33.3%	1,011	46.1%	28	35.7%	31	35.5%	1,935	92	51.1%
Eastfield College	1,091	56.9%	227	30.8%	238	39.1%	285	17.5%	28	42.9%	1,869	102	45.3%
El Centro College	167	50.9%	310	27.4%	137	38.7%	23	34.8%	22	36.4%	659	2	36.3%
El Paso Community College	512	54.5%	75	30.7%	3,452	32.7%	55	23.6%	21	23.8%	4,115	1	35.2%

Passing All Three Sections of TASP Test
Academic Year 1993 - 1994

Community and Technical Colleges

Institution	Whites Number Tested	Whites Percent Passing	Blacks Number Tested	Blacks Percent Passing	Hispanics Number Tested	Hispanics Percent Passing	Asians Number Tested	Asians Percent Passing	Others Number Tested	Others Percent Passing	Totals Number Tested	Number Exempted	Percent Pass Without Exemptions
Alvin Community College	661	58.2%	38	36.8%	121	38.0%	30	36.7%	9	44.4%	859	17	53.6%
Amarillo College	805	67.3%	29	37.9%	103	49.5%	34	44.1%	23	47.8%	994	36	63.4%
Angelina College	681	48.9%	141	21.3%	48	33.3%	10	60.0%	6	50.0%	886	10	43.8%
Austin Community College	2,213	67.3%	203	39.4%	527	49.7%	344	30.5%	315	34.6%	3,602	93	56.8%
Bee County College	235	54.0%	34	23.5%	414	29.2%	<6	33.3%	6	66.7%	692	14	37.7%
Blinn College	1,314	57.9%	197	25.4%	161	49.1%	27	51.9%	115	38.3%	1,814	0	52.3%
Brazosport College	427	68.1%	26	38.5%	116	56.0%	16	68.8%	<6	100.0%	589	22	64.7%
Brookhaven College	1,081	56.8%	142	33.1%	214	41.6%	250	29.2%	37	35.1%	1,724	28	48.5%
Cedar Valley College	373	50.7%	259	32.0%	59	37.3%	7	71.4%	<6	33.3%	701	10	42.8%
Central Texas College	507	63.5%	131	38.9%	116	43.1%	67	43.3%	96	17.7%	917	3	51.1%
Cisco Junior College	469	51.6%	89	18.0%	84	36.9%	7	42.9%	6	33.3%	655	1	44.9%
Clarendon College	303	40.6%	15	26.7%	20	35.0%	0		<6	0.0%	339	4	39.5%
College of the Mainland	478	61.5%	88	28.4%	88	52.3%	25	20.0%	33	45.5%	712	0	54.1%
Collin County Community College	1,615	64.1%	76	32.9%	120	49.2%	125	33.6%	26	34.6%	1,962	61	59.6%
Del Mar College	959	63.9%	49	40.8%	1,168	46.3%	42	47.6%	36	27.8%	2,254	42	53.4%
Eastfield College	1,331	51.2%	251	25.5%	246	35.8%	221	24.0%	29	48.3%	2,078	35	43.3%
El Centro College	210	44.3%	362	23.2%	161	37.9%	38	23.7%	20	35.0%	791	2	32.1%
El Paso Community College	476	48.5%	84	35.7%	3,060	29.8%	53	28.3%	21	33.3%	3,694	0	32.3%

Texas Institutions of Higher Education

Public Community Colleges

Institution	Administrative Officer	Main Telephone	Headcount*
Alamo Community College District A part of the ACCD 201 West Sheridan San Antonio, TX 78204-1429	Robert Ramsay Chancellor	(210) 208-8020	42,044
Northwest Vista College A part of the ACCD 3535 North Ellison Drive San Antonio, TX 78251	Jacqueline Claunch President	(210) 348-2020	5,425
Palo Alto College A part of the ACCD 1400 West Villaret Boulevard San Antonio, TX 78224	Ana M. Guzman President	(210) 921-5260	6,688
San Antonio College A part of the ACCD 1300 San Pedro Avenue San Antonio, TX 78212	Vern Loland President	(210) 733-2000	21,303
St. Philip's College A part of the ACCD 2111 Nevada Street San Antonio, TX 78203	Angie Runnels President	(210) 531-3591	8,628
Alvin Community College 3110 Mustang Road Alvin, TX 77511	Rodney Allbright President	(281) 331-6111	3,667
Amarillo College P.O. Box 447 Amarillo, TX 79178	Fred L. Williams President	(806) 371-5000	8,499
Angelina College Highway 59 South Lufkin, TX 75901	Larry Phillips President	(936) 639-1301	4,659

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Austin Community College 5930 Middle Fiskville Road Austin, TX 78752	Richard Fonte President	(512) 223-7598	27,577
Blinn College 902 College Avenue Brenham, TX 77833	Donald E. Voelter President	(979) 830-4000	12,686
Brazosport College 500 College Drive Lake Jackson, TX 77566	Millicent Valek President	(979) 230-3000	4,022
Central Texas College District Box 1800 Killeen, TX 76540-9990	James Anderson Chancellor	(254) 526-7161	7,231
Cisco Junior College Route 3, Box 3 Cisco, TX 76437	Roger Schustereit President	(254) 442-2567	2,716
Clarendon College P.O. Box 968 Clarendon, TX 79226	Myles Shelton President	(806) 874-3571	880
Coastal Bend College 3800 Charco Road Beeville, TX 78102	John Brockman President	(361) 358-2838	3,095
College of the Mainland 1200 Amburn Road Texas City, TX 77591	Homer Hayes President	(409) 938-3102	3,346
Collin County Community College District 4800 Preston Park Boulevard Plano, TX 75093	Cary Israel President	(972) 548-6790	14,179
Dallas County Community College District A part of the DCCCD 701 Elm Street Dallas, TX 75202-3299	J. William Wenrich Chancellor	(214) 860-2125	50,191
Brookhaven College A part of the DCCCD 3939 Valley View Lane Dallas, TX 75244-4906	Alice Villadsen President	(972) 860-4700	8,306
Cedar Valley College A part of the DCCCD 3030 North Dallas Avenue Lancaster, TX 75134	Carol Spencer President	(972) 860-8200	2,913
Eastfield College A part of the DCCCD 3737 Motley Drive	Rodger A. Pool President	(972) 860-7001	8,462

Mesquite, TX 75150			
El Centro College A part of the DCCCD Main and Lamar Dallas, TX 75202	Wright Lassiter President	(972) 860-2010	4,763
Mountain View College A part of the DCCCD 4849 West Illinois Avenue Dallas, TX 75211-6599	Monique Amerman President	(972) 860-8700	5,729
North Lake College A part of the DCCCD 5001 North MacArthur Boulevard Irving, TX 75038-3899	Herlinda Coronado President	(972) 273-3010	7,338
Richland College A part of the DCCCD 12800 Abrams Road Dallas, TX 75243-2199	Stephen Mittelstet President	(972) 238-6106	12,680
Del Mar College 101 Baldwin Boulevard Corpus Christi, TX 78404	Gustavo Ortiz President	(361) 698-1200	10,246
El Paso Community College District P.O. Box 20500 El Paso, TX 79998	Richard Rhodes President	(915) 831-2000	18,356
Frank Phillips College P.O. Box 5118 Borger, TX 79008-5118	Herb Swender President	(806) 274-5311	1,242
Galveston College 4015 Avenue Q Galveston, TX 77550	Elva Concha LeBlanc President	(409) 763-6551	2,207
Grayson County College 6101 Highway 691 Denison, TX 75020	Alan Scheibmeir President	(903) 465-6030	3,470
Hill College 112 Lamar Drive Hillsboro, TX 76645	William Auvenshine President	(254) 582-2555	2,694
Houston Community College System A part of the HCCS P.O. Box 667517 Houston, TX 77266-7517	Bruce Leslie Chancellor	(713) 718-5059	34,714
Central College A part of the HCCS 1300 Holman	Jack Daniels President	(713) 718-6040	0

Houston, TX 77004			
Northeast College A part of the HCCS 401 Northline Mall Houston, TX 77022	Margaret Forde President	(281) 718-8010	0
Northwest College A part of the HCCS 1550 Foxlake Drive #101 Houston, TX 77084	Zachary Hodges President	(281) 718-5721	0
Southeast College A part of the HCCS 6815 Rustic Houston, TX 77087	Sylvia Ramos President	(281) 718-7071	0
Southwest College A part of the HCCS 5407 Gulfton Houston, TX 77081	Sue Cox President	(713) 718-7748	0
Howard County Junior College District A part of the HCJCD 1001 Birdwell Lane Big Spring, TX 79720	Cheryl T. Sparks President	(915) 267-6311	2,660
Howard College A part of the HCJCD 1001 Birdwell Lane Big Spring, TX 79720	Cheryl T. Sparks President	(915) 264-5000	2,539
Southwest Collegiate Institute for the Deaf A part of the HCJCD 3200 Avenue C Big Spring, TX 79720	Ron Brazel Provost	(915) 264-3700	121
Kilgore College 1100 Broadway Kilgore, TX 75662	William M. Holda President	(903) 984-8531	4,026
Laredo Community College West End Washington Street Laredo, TX 78040-4395	Ramon Dovalina President	(956) 722-0521	7,469
Lee College 511 South Whiting Street Baytown, TX 77520-4703	Steve Evans Interim President	(281) 427-5611	6,226
McLennan Community College 1400 College Drive Waco, TX 76708	Dennis Michaelis President	(254) 299-8000	6,110

Midland College 3600 North Garfield Midland, TX 79705	David Daniel President	(915) 685-4500	5,060
Navarro College 3200 West 7th Avenue Corsicana, TX 75110	Richard Sanchez President	(903) 874-6501	4,411
North Central Texas Community College 1525 West California Gainesville, TX 76240	Ronnie Glasscock President	(940) 668-7731	5,182
North Harris Montgomery Community College District A part of the NHMCCD 250 North Sam Houston Parkway East Houston, TX 77060	John Pickelman Chancellor	(281) 260-3515	29,386
Cy-Fair College A part of the NHMCCD 9449 Grant Road Houston, TX 77070	Diane K. Troyer President	(281) 401-5302	0
Kingwood College A part of the NHMCCD 20000 Kingwood Drive Humble, TX 77339	Linda Stegall President	(281) 312-0440	5,302
Montgomery College A part of the NHMCCD 3200 Highway 242 West Conroe, TX 77384	William D. Law President	(936) 273-7000	5,776
North Harris College A part of the NHMCCD 2700 West West Thorne Drive Houston, TX 77073	David Sam President	(281) 618-5400	9,972
Tomball College A part of the NHMCCD 30555 Tomball Parkway Tomball, TX 77375-1969	Raymond Hawkins President	(281) 351-3300	8,336
Northeast Texas Community College P.O. Box 1307 Mount Pleasant, TX 75456-7307	Charles Florio President	(903) 572-1911	2,203
Odessa College 201 West University Odessa, TX 79764	Vance Gipson President	(915) 335-6400	4,545

Panola College 1109 West Panola Street Carthage, TX 75633	Gregory Powell President	(903) 693-2022	1,492
Paris Junior College 2400 Clarksville Street Paris, TX 75460	Bobby Walters President	(903) 785-7661	3,278
Ranger College College Circle Ranger, TX 76470	Joe Mills President	(254) 647-3234	840
San Jacinto College District A part of the SJCC 4624 Fairmont Parkway, Suite 200 Pasadena, TX 77504	James Horton Chancellor	(281) 998-6100	22,747
Central Campus A part of the SJCC 8060 Spencer Highway Pasadena, TX 77505	Monte Blue President	(281) 476-1501	11,139
North Campus A part of the SJCC 5800 Uvalde Road Houston, TX 77049	Charles Grant President	(281) 458-4050	4,976
South Campus A part of the SJCC 13735 Beamer Road Houston, TX 77089	Adena Williams-Loston President	(713) 484-1900	6,632
South Plains College 1401 College Avenue Levelland, TX 79336	Gary McDaniel President	(806) 894-9611	8,512
South Texas Community College P.O. Box 9701 McAllen, TX 78502-9701	Shirley Reed President	(956) 618-8368	12,443
Southwest Texas Junior College Garner Field Road Uvalde, TX 78801	Ismael Sosa, Jr. President	(830) 278-4401	3,723
Tarrant County College District A part of the TCCD 1500 Houston Street Fort Worth, TX 76102	Leonardo de la Garza Chancellor	(817) 515-5201	29,817
South Campus A part of the TCCD 5301 Campus Drive Fort Worth, TX 76119	Ernest L. Thomas President	(817) 515-4861	7,337
Tarrant County College -			

Northeast Campus A part of the TCCD 828 Harwood Road Hurst, TX 76054	Larry Darlage President	(817) 515-6200	10,035
Tarrant County College - Northwest Campus A part of the TCCD 4801 Marine Creek Parkway Fort Worth, TX 76179-3599	Michael Saenz President	(817) 515-7750	4,648
Tarrant County College - Southeast Campus A part of the TCCD 2100 Southeast Parkway Arlington, TX 76018-2907	Judith Carrier President	(817) 515-3100	7,797
Temple College 2600 South First Street Temple, TX 76504-7435	Marc A. Nigliazzo President	(254) 298-8282	3,579
Texarkana College 2500 North Robinson Road Texarkana, TX 75501	Frank Coleman President	(903) 838-4541	3,526
Texas Southmost College 80 Fort Brown Brownsville, TX 78520	Juliet Garcia President	(956) 544-8200	7,210
Victoria College, The 2200 East Red River Victoria, TX 77901	Jimmy Goodson President	(361) 573-3291	4,006
Trinity Valley Community College 100 Cardinal Drive Athens, TX 75751	Ronald Baugh President	(903) 677-8822	4,604
Tyler Junior College P.O. Box 9020 Tyler, TX 75711	William Crowe President	(903) 510-2200	8,451
Vernon College 4400 College Drive Vernon, TX 76384	Steve Thomas President	(940) 552-6291	2,269
Weatherford College 225 Park Drive Weatherford, TX 76086	Don Huff President	(817) 594-5471	3,136
Western Texas College 6200 College Avenue Snyder, TX 79549	Gregory Williams President	(915) 573-8511	1,323
Wharton County Junior College 911 Boling Highway Wharton, TX 77488	Betty A. McCrohan President	(979) 532-4560	5,281

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

Reproduction Release

(Specific Document)

TM034698

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: AN Historic, Perceptive, and Qualitative ANALYSIS of the Texas Academic SKILLS Program (TASP): Where do we go From here?

Author(s): Dr. CLENNIS F. High

Corporate Source: Houston Community College

Publication Date: September 15, 2002

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, Resources in Education (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign in the indicated space following.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
Level 1	**Level 2A**	**Level 2B**
☑	☐	☐
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g. electronic) *and* paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche, or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature: Dr. Clennis F. High

Printed Name/Position/Title: Dr. CLENNIS F. High / Counselor

Organization/Address: 555 Community College Dr. Houston, TX 77013

Telephone: (713) 718-8334

Fax: (713) 718-8101

E-mail Address: Clennis.High@hccs.com

Date: 12/3/02

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:	
ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation **1129 Shriver Laboratory (Bldg 075)** **College Park, Maryland 20742**	**Telephone: 301-405-7449** **Toll Free: 800-464-3742** **Fax: 301-405-8134** **ericae@ericae.net** **http://ericae.net**

EFF-088 (Rev. 9/97)